

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1371636



The Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

Milner's Church
History —
Exhibits the inner
life of the church

Sir James Stephens
Ecclesiastical essays
Hard to get

BR
145
693
v.2

A

MANUAL OF CHURCH HISTORY.

BY

HENRY E. F. GUERICKE,

DOCTOR AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN HALLE.

Translated from the German

BY

WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD,

BALDWIN PROFESSOR IN UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

MEDIAEVAL CHURCH HISTORY, A.D. 590—A.D. 1073.



Andover:

WARREN F. DRAPER, PUBLISHER.

MAIN STREET.

1882.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1870, by
WARREN F. DRAPER,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

ANDOVER:
PRINTED BY WARREN F. DRAPER.

NOTE.

BY THE TRANSLATOR.

THIS portion of Guericke's Church History continues the account down to A. D. 1073, when Hildebrand ascended the Papal chair as Gregory VII. It includes, among other topics, the spread of Christianity among the Gothic, Scandinavian, and Sclavic races; the distracting controversies respecting the two Wills in Christ, Image Worship, and the Sacrament of the Supper; and the great schism between the East and West. With the previous volume, published in 1857, this addition comprises the History of the Church during the first Ten Centuries.

CONTENTS.

MEDIAEVAL CHURCH HISTORY.

Characteristics of the Romano-Germanic Age of the Church	Page 1
--	-----------

THIRD PERIOD: A. D. 590—814.

SECTION FIRST.

THE SPREAD AND LIMITATION OF CHRISTIANITY.

CHAPTER FIRST.

OPPOSITION TO CHRISTIANITY.

§ 95. Persian and Mohammedan Persecution	3
--	---

CHAPTER SECOND.

THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

§ 96. Christianity in England	9
97. Christianity in Germany	12
98. Christianity in Asia	23

SECTION SECOND.

CHURCH POLITY.

§ 99. Relation between Church and State	25
100. Monachism and the Clergy	28
101. Formation of the Papacy	31

SECTION THIRD.

CHRISTIAN LIFE AND WORSHIP.

§ 102. Christian Life and Culture	39
103. Christian Worship	42

SECTION FOURTH.

HISTORY OF DOCTRINE.

CHAPTER FIRST.

THEOLOGY AND CONTROVERSIES.

	Page
§ 104. Theology in the West	47
105. Theology in the East	51
106. Monothelite Controversy	53
107. Adoption Controversy	60
108. Image Controversy	63
109. Image Controversy (<i>continued</i>)	65
110. Dogmatico-Historical Survey	72

CHAPTER SECOND.

SECTS.

§ 111. Paulicians.	76
----------------------------	----

FOURTH PERIOD: A.D. 814—1073.

SECTION FIRST.

THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

§ 112. Christian Missions in Northern Europe	81
113. Christian Missions among the Slaves	91

SECTION SECOND.

CHURCH POLITY.

§ 114. The Papal Constitution	99
115. The Popes	102
116. Church and State	112
117. The Clergy and Monachism	115

SECTION THIRD.

CHRISTIAN LIFE AND WORSHIP.

§ 118. Christian Life	119
119. Christian Worship	121
120. Opposition to Superstition	124

SECTION FOURTH

HISTORY OF DOCTRINE.

CHAPTER FIRST.

THEOLOGY AND CONTROVERSIES.

	Page
§ 121. Separation between the Eastern and Western Churches .	530
122. Theology in the West	537
123. Predestination Controversy	543
124. Sacramentarian Controversy	550
125. Dogmatico-Historical Survey	152
126. Sects	153

MEDIÆVAL CHURCH HISTORY.

THE ROMANO-GERMANIC AGE OF THE CHURCH :

FROM GREGORY THE GREAT TO THE REFORMATION.

A. D. 590–1517.

THE dominant Characteristic of Mediæval Church History, in its four periods, consists in the fact that the Church no longer receives its form and impress from the ancient Græco-Roman empire, but from the Germanic races and the new modern Rome. Hence, the third period in the general history of the Church (590–814) describes the conversion of the German populations to Christianity ; the fourth period (814–1073) shows how Rome took occasion, from the formation of the German Church, to build up its hierarchy, and how the contest between the Italian and German Churches became the central point of the history ; the fifth period (1073–1294) exhibits the Romish hierarchy at its height of power and influence ; and the sixth period (1294–1517) presents it in its decline, preparatory to the Reformation and prophetic of it. Meanwhile, the Greek Church, forced into narrower limits by Mohammedanism, internally corrupted by the Image Controversy, and petrified into formalism by its connection with the Byzantine court, loses more and more its importance in Ecclesiastical History. Although the Middle Age in Church History properly begins with the seventh century, yet it does not acquire, until the ninth cen-

ture, the distinct character of a period of transition, from the Ancient Christianity shaped by the culture of the classic world, to the Mediæval Christianity moulded by the traits of those new Gothic races which were brought upon the theatre of action by the migration of nations. The substance of Mediæval Church History, consequently, consists in the conflict of an old and finished with a new and forming civilization, as it is seen, through all the mediæval centuries, in mighty waves of action and reaction, in fermenting and turbid elements, until, in the sixteenth century, the reformatory spirit and tendency penetrates and pervades the entire mass, and the Middle Ages are at an end.

THIRD PERIOD : A. D. 590—814.

SECTION FIRST.

The Spread and Limitation of Christianity.

CHAPTER FIRST.

OPPOSITION TO CHRISTIANITY.

§ 95.

PERSIAN AND MOHAMMEDAN PERSECUTION.

Abulfeda De vita et rebus gestis Mohammedis (Mohammedan). Priedeaux La vie de Mahomet. Gagnier La vie de Mohammed. Giger Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judenthum aufgenommen? Von Hammer-Purgstall Mohammed der Prophet. Dollinger Muhammed's Religion. Weil Mohammed der prophet. Forster Mohammedanism Unveiled. Bush Life of Mohammed. Irving Life of Mohammed. Gibbon Decline and Fall, Chap. L. Arnold Natural History of Islamism.

SEVERE persecution of the Church marked the opening of the Mediæval Centuries. Great distress, though only temporary and local, befell the Christians of the East, at the beginning of the seventh century, through the enmity of Chosroes II., King of Persia; but a far more lasting and widely extended persecution arose, soon after, from a new and false religious system.

When the Persian king, Chosroes II., took the city of Jerusalem, in June, 614, and soon after wrested from the Roman empire several other provinces, the Christian institutions of these countries were broken up, and the Christians themselves met with bloody persecution, or, in some few

instances, were forced to adopt the Nestorian heresy. Many thousands in Jerusalem, particularly clergymen, monks, and consecrated virgins, were slain at the capture of the city, the splendid church edifices were thrown down, and the patriarch Zacharias with others was carried away to Persia. But this was only a transient persecution. The emperor Heraclius, in several successful battles between the years 622 and 628, wholly overcame Chosroes, and the Church was restored to its old position. The Christian prisoners were freed; and Heraclius carried back into Jerusalem, upon his own shoulders, the "true cross," which had been captured with the patriarch Zacharias. But soon after these events a much more terrible enemy arose against the Church.

It was an evident token, not only for particular portions of the Church but for all Christendom, of the punitive justice and the chastising love of God, that Christianity for a time lost its sway, and a new and false religion was established throughout a large part of its dominions. The spirit of the world had found entrance into the Church; the professors of Christianity, occupied with idle musings or frivolous dialectical disputes, had lost sight of the true nature of their religion; Christian societies had ceased to be the salt of the earth; and the originally simple worship of the church had become sensuous and idolatrous. This declension was greatest at the East, and in this part of Christendom now arose the *Mohammedan Religion*, claiming to be the primitive patriarchal monotheism, the only genuine theism, purified from the foreign elements that had come into it from Judaism and Christianity;¹ but which, in fact was, at best, nothing

¹ What particular positive purpose in the Divine plan, Islamism is to subserve, besides its negative function as a punitive judgment upon the degenerate Eastern Church, is a difficult problem in the philosophy of history. Perhaps, by means of its rigid and fanatical monotheism, and its local position midway between the fetichism and cannibalism of Africa and the pantheism of Asia, it is destined to prepare the way for Christianity. [The features in Mohammedanism most hostile to the Christian religion, are, its exclusion of the doctrine of the trinity, by its unitarian idea of the Deity; of the doctrine of Christ's divinity, by its elevation of Mohammed; of the doctrine of sin, by its doctrine of faith; and of the doctrine of redemption, by its doctrine of paradise. — TRANSLATOR].

but Judaism, or Judaistic Christianity, degraded to the level of natural religion, and emptied of all its distinctive characteristics as a revealed system.¹

Abul Kasem Mohammed was born in 569, or 570, at Mecca in Arabia, of the race of Ishmael, of the tribe of Koreishites, and of the family of Hashem, to which belonged by inheritance the care of the Kaaba, the common Arabic sanctuary at Mecca. Stirred, in the midst of Sabaeism and other forms of idolatry, by the reminiscences and relics of the old primitive monotheism, he became acquainted with the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and, at first, his passionate mind and nature seem to have been somewhat influenced by them. He was content, in the beginning of his career, with being regarded as the teacher and prophet of the polytheistic Arabic tribes, whose idol-worship he opposed. Elated by his success, and the enthusiasm he had awakened, he soon enlarged his pretensions, and commenced a violent opposition to both Jews and Christians. Denuding the truths which he had borrowed from both Judaism and Christianity, of their distinguishing characteristics, and aided, perhaps, by demoniacal arts,² in convincing his followers of his supernatural office and mission, he shrank not from adopting the great idea of Christianity, that all nations are to become one flock, under one shepherd. And since spiritual weapons were wanting for the realization of his plan, he substituted those of the flesh, and became the founder of the only religion in the world that has been extended by such instrumentalities.

In the year 611 he began, at first secretly, and then publicly, to promulgate his new religion, at Mecca. On July 15th, 622, he was forced to flee before the sword of his ene-

¹ Mohammedanism conceded to Judaism and Christianity a historical significance, as earlier but falsified revelations from God, preparatory to itself. Abraham, Moses, and Christ, were worthy of honor, but greater honor was due to Mohammed. Jerusalem and its temple were sacred, but yet more sacred were Mecca and Medina.

² Respecting the miracles of Mohammed, see Tholuck *Die Wunder Mohammeds*. Vermischte Schriften Thl. I.

570
Mecca

mies.¹ He gained over the city of Medina to his cause; the number of his adherents continually increased. In 630 he captured Mecca; and as prince and prophet consecrated the Kaaba as the chief temple of *Islamism*;² leaving at his death, in 632,³ to his successors, the caliphs, (i.e. vicegerents), the whole of Arabia subject to his sway and obedient to his religion. The first caliph, *Abubekr*, Mohammed's father-in-law,⁴ collected, in 604, the revelations which Mohammed professed to have received, at different times, and for special cases, through the angel Gabriel. This work, entitled the *Korân*⁵ (divided into 114 suras or sections), is the sacred book of the Mohammedans. It is composed of disconnected sentences, of a commonplace, bombastic, and declamatory character, and in many parts is a wretched imitation of portions of the Old and New Testaments. With the *Korân* are also associated two other works, that are authoritative sources of Mohammedan doctrine. The first, entitled the *Hadith* or *Sunna*, is a collection of the oral teachings of the "prophet;" and the second, called *Idschma el-Umme*, is the consensus of doctrine according to the more immediate heads of Islamism.

Before his death, Mohammed had sent ambassadors to emperors and kings, demanding that they should acknowledge himself to be the messenger of God, and had made a successful beginning in compelling faith in his religion by

¹ The date of this flight (Hegira, or Hedschra) is the Mohammedan epoch.

² Islâm signifies submission to God, resignation; Imân means faith. Hence the Mohammedans are called either Muslimîn or Mûminîn.

³ His death was caused by eating the flesh of a poisoned sheep, which a Jewess had set before him after the storming of the Jewish city Chaibar. According to the story, Mohammed took a piece of the flesh, chewed it, but spat it out, saying, 'This sheep tells me that it is poisoned.' But the poison was left in his system, and he ever after complained that the meat of Chaibar troubled him. In his last hours, just before his death, he said to his favorite wife Aisha: "The meat of Chaibar is bursting all my veins."

⁴ Mohammed left no sons, and only one daughter, Fatima, who became the wife of Ali.

⁵ Edited in Arabic, with a Latin translation, by Marraccius, Patav, 1698; Arabic text edited by Redslob, and published by Tauchnitz, 1837; translated into English by Sale, London, 1734; into German by L. Ullmann; and into French by Savary, 1782, and Pauthier, 1844.

the sword. Animating his successors by the assurance that God had given the world into their hands, they followed up his designs by his method. They were favored by the weak condition of the Roman Empire, and the dissensions of the Oriental Church. Under the leadership of *Omar*, the second and greatest of the caliphs, and his successors,¹ the Mohammedans conquered Syria and Palestine² (639), Egypt (640), Persia (651), North Africa (807), and Spain (711).³ They pushed forward even into France, with the design of connecting the East with the West by a line of conquests, and building a firm bridge for the passage of their religion from the Asiatic to the European world. But this design was frustrated by the victory of the French king, *Charles Martel*, at the battle of Poitiers, in 732, which forever broke the Arabic power north of the Pyrenees. Though repulsed in the West, the Mohammedans afterwards twice laid siege to Constantinople, — once in 669–670, and again in 717–718. Islamism threw down all the walls of separation between the nations which it overran, but was itself, in the midst of its victories, split into two great parties, by the dispute respecting the succession to Mohammed's office and power, and the differences relating to the Mohammedan theology that were connected with it. The two parties were headed by *Omar*, and *Ali*, Mohammed's son-in-law, who became the fourth caliph (654–660). The great division of the *Shiites* (to which the Persians belong) held that the civil and religious offices of caliph and imam belonged to the line of Ali alone, and rejected the first three caliphs, together with the entire body of traditions, from Abubekr downward. In opposition to them, the orthodox moslems, who called themselves the *Sunnites* (Ahl es-Sunna, the people of the

¹ *Histoires des Arabes sous le gouvernement des Califes*, par De Marigny, Paris, 1750; Von Hammer Gemäldeaal moslimischer Herrscher.

² Jerusalem was captured in 637 by the Saracens under the Caliph Omar, who, by stipulation with the patriarch *Sophronius*, granted to the inhabitants their lives, property, and churches; only converting the national temple into a mosque. Jerusalem, with its patriarchs, remained under the Mohammedan yoke until it was temporarily delivered from it by the Crusaders.

³ Murphy History of the Mahometan Empire in Spain, London, 1816.

tradition), "respected the memory of Abubekr, Omar, Othman, and Ali, as the holy and legitimate successors of the prophet, but assigned the humblest place to the last." This division of the Mohammedans was dominant at the Ottoman court, and throughout the Ottoman Empire.

Mohammedanism granted toleration to the Christians upon the payment of a poll-tax; but many Christians in the conquered countries, especially in the East, from fear or hope of earthly advantage, followed the fortunes of the victors, and adopted their religion, so that the Christian Church in these regions lost almost entirely its visible form. The Catholic patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria were henceforth only nominal and titular. The Saracenic persecution in Spain was the only instance in which the Mohammedans spilt Christian blood. The Saracen laws had allowed the Christians the free practice of their religion, and they had, in fact, been but little molested, until, about the year 850, Saracen arrogance enkindled the martyr zeal. This soon passed the bounds of Christian sobriety and prudence, in a fanatical party of Christians, who were urged on by the presbyter *Eulogius* of Cordova, afterwards bishop of Toledo, and his friend *Paul Alvarus*, notwithstanding the endeavor of the council of Cordova in 852 to restrain their enthusiasm. A somewhat long and bloody persecution was the consequence. But in the mountains of northern Spain a prolonged and chivalrous contest for national independence and Christianity, in opposition to the Arabic dominion, was even now beginning, and Christianity conquered in the end.

CHAPTER SECOND.

THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

§ 96.

CHRISTIANITY IN ENGLAND.

Gale Historiae Britannicae, Saxonicae, Anglo-Danicae Scriptores, in Gal-landi Bibliotheca XII. 189, sq. Lingard The Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church. Turner History of the Anglo-Saxons. Schrödl Das erste Jahrhundert der Englischen Kirche. Bede Ecclesiastical History. Wilkins Concilia Magnae Britannicae et Hiberniae. Usher Britannicae Ecclesiae Antiquitates. Lanigan Ecclesiastical History of Ireland. Hume History of England.

CHRISTIANITY had become firmly established in Ireland and Scotland during the preceding period (§ 68); but in the meanwhile the *Anglo-Saxons*, by their invasion, had to a great degree broken up the ancient British churches and Christian institutions in England, and introduced paganism again. The conversion of the Saxons and the re-Christianizing of England proceeded from Rome.

Gregory the Great, while yet a Roman abbot, had been deeply moved to go as a missionary to England, by the sight of young pagan Anglo-Saxon slaves, and was prevented only by the pressing entreaties of the Roman Church (Bede's Ecclesiastical history, b. II. c. 1). After being appointed bishop of Rome, in 590, he was purposing to buy Anglo-Saxon slaves, in order to instruct them in Christianity, that they might disseminate it in their native land, when a favorable circumstance afforded him a more speedy opportunity of carrying out his design. *Ethelbert*, king of Kent, the most powerful prince in the English heptarchy, had married

Bertha, a Christian princess, the daughter of a French king. Emboldened by this fact, Gregory ordained, in 596, a Roman abbot *Augustine* together with a presbyter *Laurentius* (St. Lawrence) and a monk *Peter*, and some thirty other monks, as missionaries to England. While on their journey the company were frightened by reports of the savage wildness of the Anglo-Saxons, but were reassured and strengthened in their purpose by Gregory's Christian exhortations (Gregorii Epp. vi. 51) and Augustine's courage, and in 597 landed upon the little island of Thanet, east of Kent. At first, the king, from whom after announcing their arrival they reverently withdrew and kept themselves solemnly aloof, took them to be magicians. But soon he gave them his confidence, granted them permission to preach the gospel, even in his chief city Durover (Canterbury), and in 597 received baptism himself, without, however, compelling his people to follow his example, as Augustine had taught him that the service of Christ is a voluntary one. After laboring for some time with great success,¹ Augustine, in conformity with instructions from Rome, went to Arles to receive episcopal ordination from archbishop Etherick, in order that he might discharge the office of a bishop in the new church. He then sent Laurentius and Peter to Rome, to give an account to Gregory of what had been accomplished, and to ask advice in reference to the future. To his inquiries Gregory gave very wise and discreet replies. He dissuaded him from all narrow and stiff adherence to the usages of the Roman church, recommended moderation in the suppression of idol-worship, and bade him estimate the miracles by which he supposed his missionary work was accompanied, by their practical effects upon the hearts of the heathen (Gregorii Epp. xi. 28). At the same time he sent copies of the Bible, and a new corps of assistants with the abbot *Mellitus* at their head, and appointed Augustine archbishop of London, with the commission to found a second arch-

¹ Upon one Christmas festival, ten thousand were baptized (Gregorii Epp. VIII. 30).

bishopric at Eboracum (York). But as London belonged to Essex and not to Kent, Augustine chose Durover for his archiepiscopal seat, and thus Canterbury became the principal metropolitan church for England.

It was now a leading aim of Augustine to bring about a union between the old British and the new English churches. Several peculiar usages, such for example, as the adoption of the Oriental time of celebrating Easter, together with an unwillingness to subject themselves to the Roman church, separated the ancient Britons in England from the Roman and Anglo-Saxon churches, and these differences were aggravated by the national hatred of the Britons toward the Anglo-Saxons. A conference was held between the parties but without results. The British bishops desired the advice of a national council; a synod was held at *Wigorn* (Worcester) in 601, but owing to the mistrust of the Britons towards Augustine, who did not appear to them to be sufficiently humble and unassuming, no union of the two churches was effected.¹

Augustine was succeeded, in 605, by *Laurentius*, who had the pain of seeing Ethelbert's son and successor, *Eadbald* (616), fall away from Christianity, from dislike of the strict morality that interfered with his sensual habits. He experienced a still greater grief, when the three pagan sons of the first Christian king of Essex banished Mellitus and all his clergy from London. They first took refuge with *Laurentius*, and then went over into Gaul. *Laurentius* himself was on the point of following them, but was held back by a terrible vision, in which the apostle Peter appeared to him and rebuked him for his weakness. The recital of this vision brought the young king *Eadbald* to reflection and

¹ The intercourse between the English and British churches was brought about at a later day, by the residence of English monks in Irish cloisters. Carrying the Irish culture and books with them into England, the differences between the two parties were first removed internally, and this prepared for the external union which was effected at a synod held near York in 664. *Oswin*, the king of Northumberland, declared for the Romish church, and *Theodore*, the archbishop of Canterbury (669-690), introduced the Romish order and ritual.

repentance, so that he again restored the Christian church in Kent.

Christianity, from this time forward, was constantly acquiring strength in England, by the founding of cloisters, churches, and schools. In the course of the seventh century it spread, with some fluctuations, from Kent into the other Anglo-Saxon states. *Northumberland* now became the principal point from which its further extension proceeded. The first Christian king of Northumberland was *Edwin*, the husband of *Ethelberga*, Eadbald's sister, who had brought with her from Kent, as her spiritual guide, *Paulinus*, afterwards bishop of York. Edwin died in 633, and, after a brief success on the part of the old paganism, was succeeded by *Oswald* (†642), who with *Aidan*, a monk from Iona, labored earnestly and with true Christian zeal for the spread of Christianity. Finally, in 668, Sussex received the Christian faith.

§ 97.

CHRISTIANITY IN GERMANY.

Rettberg Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands. Hefele Geschichte der Einführung des Christenthums im südwestlichen Deutschland. Popp Anfang und Verbreitung des Christenthums im südlichen Deutschland. Von Raumer Die Einwirkung des Christenthums auf die althochdeutsche Sprache. Spieker Geschichte der Reformation in Deutschland.

IN *France*, Christianity had become the dominant religion, in the preceding period, through the baptism of *Clovis* (§ 68. 2), and was gradually strengthened by the establishment of rich churches and cloisters. But the rapacity of the French nobles in seizing upon the property of the church, and the ensuing distractions of the French kingdom, wrought disastrously upon the French church, so that instead of France being the source from whence Christianity passed into *Germany*, the French church itself in the eighth century needed to be restored by the Germanic Christianity.

Many portions of *Germania Cisrhenana* had been Christianized, during the preceding periods, from their connection with the Roman empire. The *castra stativa* gradually grew into cities, and as early as the third and fourth centuries, mention is made of bishops of Cologne, Treves, Liege, Mayence, Worms, Strasburg, and Basle. But all, as yet, was the product of individual efforts, and not calculated for permanency. The migrations of the pagan populations unsettled and deranged many things, which were re-established to some extent by the connection of these regions with France. Thus about the year 600, the French anchorite *Goar* labored along the Rhine, and preached the gospel to the neighboring tribes, afterwards giving his name to the city of St. Goar. But of far more importance for the spread of Christianity among the German people than this connection with Rome and France, was the influence of monks from *Britain*; first Irish, and afterwards English.

About the year 590, *Columban*, who had been educated in the renowned monastery of *Bangor*, a man of remarkable energy and faith, together with no inconsiderable scientific culture, crossed over into France, and established himself in Burgundy. Accompanied by several young men, some of whom were of noble families, among them *Gallus*, he settled down in the wild region of the *Vosges*, cultivating the soil, and founding the cloisters Anegrey, Luxeuil, and Fontenay. By his plainness of speech and strictness in discipline, he drew upon himself the hatred of the nobles, and especially of the powerful princess Brunhild. At the same time, by his persistence in some usages of the Irish church that were contrary to those of Rome, — particularly in following the Asia Minor custom respecting the observance of Easter, — he involved himself in many disputes with the French bishops. The consequence was his banishment by the French king Thierry, in 610. He went to *Switzerland*, and began missionary labors in the region of Zurich. By reason of the destruction of an idol temple, he and his associates were driven from thence to Bregentz, where they obtained the good-will of the pagan population by distributing the

products of their gardening and fishing. After three years' labor here, Columban was forced to flee once more from the violence of a pagan prince. He betook himself to a valley in Liguria, among the Pennine Alps, and founded the monastery of Bobbio, near Pavia, where he died in 615. In the meanwhile *Gallus*, who had been left behind in Switzerland, on account of sickness, in believing trust laid the foundation, in 613 or 614, of the monastery of St. Gall, in a wild region, and upon the banks of the river Steinach. The universal confidence which he acquired by his benevolent labors, led to his appointment to the bishopric of Costnitz in 615; but he refused it, and a native deacon *Johannes* was elected, at whose consecration Gallus preached a Latin discourse, which the newly appointed bishop interpreted to the congregation. Gallus died at the castle of Arbon in 640, whither he had gone to meet his old friend the priest Wilmer, — according to a doubtful tradition being in his ninety-fifth year.

In the region now known as *Franconia*, where, perhaps, a feeble germ of Christianity may have been previously planted after the conquest of the Thuringians by the Franks in 527, the Irish monk *Cyllena* or *Cylian* labored after the year 650. At Würzburg, he baptized a certain duke Gozbert, but was murdered in 689 by Geilane, the wife of the duke, whose marriage with the brother of her deceased husband Cylian had condemned and sought to annul.

In *Bavaria*, a part of Germany that felt less of the influence of British missionaries and more of that of French, there were vestiges still remaining of that Christianity which had probably gone there in the preceding period through the instrumentality of the abbot *Severinus*. This remarkable man, though a native of the West, came into Noricum, (Austria and Bavaria) from the distant East, about the year 453, and labored there for twenty or thirty years amidst the dreadful convulsions of the period succeeding the death of Attila, dispensing far and wide the temporal and spiritual blessings of the gospel, in the exercise of a deep ascetic self-denial, and a self-sacrificing love.¹ At a later day, the

¹ See his life by his pupil, the abbot Eugippius, in *Acta Sanctorum* Mens Jan. T. I. p. 483; also Neander *Denkwürdigkeiten* III. 1.

abbot *Eustasius* of Luxeuil and the monk *Agil*, having been sent upon a missionary tour by a French synod in 613, are said to have travelled as far as Bavaria, and to have found occasion for opposing a heresy prevailing there respecting the divinity of Christ. About 651 *Emmeran*, a bishop from Aquitania, as he was passing through Bavaria with the intention of commencing missionary work in Hungary, was induced to remain by the Bavarian duke Theodo I. He labored three years in Bavaria, when he was savagely murdered near Regensburg, while upon a journey, by a son of the duke. Subsequently, about 700, *Rudbert* or *Ruprecht* bishop of Worms, descended from a royal Frank family, having been invited to Bavaria by Theodo II, whom he baptized, founded a monastery and church on the site of the old Roman city Juvavia. This afterwards expanded into the bishopric of Salzburg. A short time afterward, the Frankish hermit *Corbinian* (†730) planted a church at Freisingen.

The spread of Christianity encountered most hinderance amongst the savage *Saxons* and *Frieslanders*. The first attempts to evangelize the Frieslanders, on the Frankish borders, were made by some Frankish bishops. *Amandus*, appointed in 626 an itinerant bishop without any fixed diocese (episcopus regionarius), labored in the districts of the Schelde, finally becoming bishop of Maastricht (†679). The excellent *Eligius* (St. Eloy),¹ first a goldsmith, and afterwards bishop of Noyon (†659), toiled with indefatigable zeal for eighteen years, to Christianize his extensive diocese, which bordered upon the pagan tribes. The efforts of these missionaries were furthered by the subjugation of a portion of Friesland by Pipin, the Frankish mayor of the palace. Encouraged by an English monk *Egbert*, who had purposed, in conformity with a vow made in sickness, to go upon a mission to the Frieslanders, but had been prevented, the English monk and presbyter *Willibrord*,² commenced his missionary labors among them (about 680). He had been prepared for

¹ His interesting biography, by his disciple Audoen, is found in D'Achery *Spicilegium*, T. II.

² See Alcuin's life of Willibrord.

the work by a residence of twelve years in Ireland. Accompanied by twelve associates, he made his appearance at the court of Pipin, who assigned him a field of labor in the northern portion of the Frankish kingdom, among the conquered Frieslanders. During the visit which he made to Rome, in 692, at the outset of his enterprise, in order to place himself in harmonious relations with the Roman bishop, his associates caused *Suidbert* (†713), one of their number, to be ordained as bishop. Suidbert labored in Westphalia until an irruption of the Saxons compelled him to flee, when he received from Pipin the island of Kaiserworth, in the Rhine, for the purpose of founding a monastery. After his return from Rome, Willibrord labored with much success in Frankish Friesland, established the archbishopric of Utrecht as a centre for missions among the Frieslanders, and in 696 was consecrated as archbishop under the name of *Clement*. His attempts to diffuse Christianity among that portion of the Frieslanders who were not under Frankish rule, but were the subjects of the savage Radbod, were for a long time fruitless, although he travelled as far as Denmark upon his benevolent errand. It was only during the latter years of his life, that any bright prospects opened before him in these regions. After the death of Pipin, in 714, Radbod extended his dominion; but he was conquered in 717 by the Frankish mayor of the palace, Charles Martel, and soon after died, in 719. The ascendancy which this energetic prince now obtained over the subdued populations was favorable to the spread of Christianity amongst them. Willibrord at length found one of his most zealous supporters in *Wursing*, a distinguished Frieslander, and after a long and fruitful life of service died in 739, in his eighty-first year.

Much as had been accomplished for the spread of Christianity in single regions of Germany, yet there had been no systematic plan of operations, and there were no established institutions for Christian education, by means of which the new religion could be perpetuated free from pagan admixtures, and a common German church be formed. The task of strengthening the existing missionary churches, of found-

ing new ones in every part of Germany, and of organizing them all into a national unity, was devolved upon *Boniface*, the apostle to the Germans, — a spiritual hero, to whom Germany owes both its Christianity and its nationality.

Boniface, or more properly *Winifred*, was born about 683, in Kirton in Wessex (Devonshire). He had been destined by his parents, who were of the higher rank in life, to a civil profession, but the influence of his early religious training inclined him to a monastic life. He received a scientific and biblical education in two of the most noted of the English cloisters, Exeter and Nutescelle; and acquired an early distinction for mental ability and administrative talent. Stirred by the example of the English missionaries of the day, he undertook his first missionary journey in 715 to the *Frieslanders*. He failed to accomplish anything among them; but the unfavorable result of his first attempt in the missionary work, did not discourage him. On the contrary, after his return to his convent, he felt it to be his vocation to carry the gospel and its blessings to the *Germans*, a people kindred to his own. For this reason, he declined an abbey that was offered him, and sharing the feeling of his age respecting the importance of a connection with the strong and central Roman Church, journeyed to Rome, in 718, to obtain the patronage and authority of the Roman bishop, *Gregory II*. He carried letters of recommendation from his friend *Daniel*, bishop of Winchester, and received a commission from Gregory. After making a preliminary missionary journey into Thuringia, in order to inform himself respecting the nature of his future field, he assisted the archbishop Willibrord, at Utrecht, among the Frieslanders, for the space of three years. Willibrord desired him for his successor, and the archbishopric was offered to him; but feeling that he was called to another work, he declined it, and in 722 went to *Thuringia* and *Hessia*, which from this time were the principal seat of his labors, and where he laid the first foundations of the church in the heart of Germany. At Amoeneburg, in Upper Hessia, he baptized two pagan princes, founded the first monastery of the region, and con-

tinued to labor, amidst many dangers and difficulties, upon the borders between Hessa and Saxony. At the invitation of Gregory II. he went again to Rome, in 723, and was consecrated, under the name of *Boniface*, as bishop without diocesan limits (*episcopus regionarius*) for the new German church. He took the oath of a bishop of the Italian Church, at the tomb of the Apostle Peter, whereby he bound himself "by God's help, to continue in the unity of the Catholic faith," and in every way to keep his doctrine and practice pure before Gregory, "the representative of the Apostle Peter," and the Roman Church, "upon which Christ had bestowed the power to bind and loose." The conviction had already been formed in his mind, that a connection with the ruler of the Franks would be advantageous to his missionary plans, and he accordingly took letters of recommendation from Rome to Charles Martel, and secured his coöperation. His object was not to substitute force for the operation of Christian truth in the heart,—for the conversion of the soul was his principal aim, in furtherance of which he imported many copies of the Scriptures and expository works from England,—but to obtain the necessary protection for the institutions which he should found, and to secure Christianity from the remnant of idolatry which threatened its purity. He now went again through *Hessa* and *Thuringia*, preaching the word. To give a shock to the superstition of the natives, he boldly cut down an ancient oak sacred to Thor, the god of thunder, which stood near the town of Geismar, and upon the spot constructed, out of the timber, a church consecrated to St. Peter. Deeming the monastery to be of the highest importance, as a seminary for the education of youth and the training of a ministry, as well as a supporting centre for missionary operations amongst a pagan population, he established a cloister at Fritzlar, and at Altenberg in Thuringia planted the first church in this part of Germany, and afterwards founded a monastery together with a church at Orthorp in the modern Gotha. In the year 732, the Roman bishop Gregory III, consecrated him to the office of archbishop and apostolical vicar, with the power

to ordain as many suffragan bishops as he should think necessary.

After making a third journey to Rome in 738, *Boniface* began to arrange and organize the ecclesiastical affairs of Germany. First, in 739, he established, at the invitation of duke Odilo of Bavaria, four bishoprics for the *Bavarian Church*; viz. Salzburg, Freisingen, Regensburg, and Passau. His succeeding labors in christianizing Germany were facilitated by the death of Charles Martel, in 741, and the accession to the throne, of his sons *Pipin* and *Carloman*. Charles Martel, though generally favoring the plans of Boniface, frequently counteracted them, by inducing the clergy to engage in his warlike expeditions, and bestowing churches and cloisters upon his favorites among them; but his sons entered into his missionary aims with a much more intelligent sympathy, — Carloman himself finally becoming a monk. With this support, he was enabled to carry out two measures that were of great importance in the organization and establishment of the German Church. The first was the foundation, in 742, of three new bishoprics for the church in *East France*, *Hessia*, and *Thuringia*, — viz. at Würzburg, Büraburg near Fritzlar, and Erfurt, to which was soon added a fourth at Eichstadt. The second measure was the introduction, in 742, of regular provincial synods. These *German synods*, held under the presidency of Boniface as the papal legate, were principally engaged with ordinances relating to the conduct and duties of the clergy, with the suppression of pagan superstition and superstitious practices, with the promotion of Christian education amongst the people, with the removal of divisions which were liable to become exceedingly dangerous in a new and growing church among a rude population, and with the suppression of rising doctrinal errors. As these synods were sometimes held in the towns of the Frankish kingdom, and Frankish bishops took part in them, one natural consequence was the introduction of the synodal system into the disordered Frankish Church, and its reformation and strengthening thereby.

In order to the complete consolidation of the new church, one thing was still wanting. This was a centre, to be the permanent and recognized seat of the archbishop; for Boniface, hitherto, had not been circumscribed by any limits in his missionary operations. At first he was inclined to choose Cologne for his archepiscopal seat, because of its proximity to the Frieslanders; but when, in 745, Gebilib, bishop of Mentz, was deposed by a synod, for transgressing the laws of the church in sending a challenge and killing his opponent, Boniface was appointed archbishop of *Mentz*. Desiring, however, to devote himself constantly to his missionary journeys among the new churches, he soon sought to be released from the office, and asked leave of the Roman pope to appoint and ordain his own successor. For a long time the pope opposed his wishes. At length he gave his permission, and Boniface devolved his archbishopric upon his tried pupil and friend, the Anglo-Saxon presbyter *Lullus*, who was consecrated archbishop of Mentz in 755, Pipin and the pope both giving their consent. The venerable man now devoted his last days to preaching the gospel, amidst difficulties and dangers. He went again to the *Frieslanders*, and met with great success among them. Having baptised a large number, he set a time for them to present themselves for confirmation. On the morning of the appointed day, a great multitude, not of converted Christians, but of savage and enraged pagans, made their appearance. Boniface exhorted his companions to shed no blood, pillowed his head upon a volume of the gospels, and died a martyr's death at Docetum on the fifth of June, 755, in the seventy-fifth year of his age. Fifty-two of his companions died the same death. His body was buried, according to his wishes, in his favorite cloister *Fulda*.¹

¹ The writings of Boniface have been edited by Würdtwein, Mogunt, 1789; and translated into German by Wisz, Fulda 1842. For his biography see: Willibald (A. D. 760), *Vita Bonifacii* in Canisii *Lectiones* and Pertz *Monumenta*; Othlo *Vita Bonifacii* (A. D. 1050) in Canisii *Lectiones* and *Acta Sanctorum Jun. T. I.* p. 452; Gudenii *Dissertatio de Bonifac.*; Geisler *Bonifaz der Teutschen Apostel*; Neander *Denkwürdigkeiten*, and Church History III. 46 sq.; Seiter (Catholic) *Bonifacius der Apostel der Deutschen*; Rettberg *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*.

The pupils of Boniface continued the work in his spirit. Among them, the following were the most distinguished. *Gregory, abbot of Utrecht*,¹ was the grandson of *Adela*, a daughter of Dagobert II., who had become the abbess of a cloister in Treves. At the age of fourteen, he was so deeply impressed by the exposition by Boniface of a passage of scripture which he himself had read aloud at the table of his grandmother, that he insisted upon accompanying him in all his dangerous journeys. He was with Boniface during his last journey into Friesland, and afterwards was intrusted, both by the pope Stephen, and king Pipin, with the sole care of the Friesland mission. Declining the archbishopric of Utrecht, he took charge of the monastery which was established there, for the purpose of training English, French, and German youth for the missionary work. He died a peaceful and triumphant death, after three years of helpless paralysis, in 781. *Sturmi, abbot of Fulda*, of a noble Bavarian family, received his training partly from Boniface himself, and partly in the monastery at Fritzlar. During the first three years of his priesthood, he assisted Boniface in his missionary labors, but was afterwards engaged in important enterprises for christianizing the German nation. In 736, he laid, with prayer and psalms of praise, the foundations of the monastery of Hersfeld, in the vast beechen forest (Buchonia) which covered the greater portion of Hessia; and, in 744, after a long search for a more suitable and safer location than that of Hersfeld, he founded the important monastery of *Fulda*, which became the favorite foundation of Boniface, and received great privileges from the pope. Here, for many years, Sturmi directed the energies of four thousand monks in subduing the wilderness, and reducing it to cultivation. He died on the 17th of June in 799, his last days being harassed by the inroads of the Saxons.²

¹ See his biography by his pupil *Luidger*; and compare *Neander Church History* III. 72 sq., and *Denkwürdigkeiten* III.

² See his biography by his pupil and successor *Eigil*, in *Pertz Monumenta T. II*; and compare *Neander Church History* III. 74, sq., and *Denkwürdigkeiten* III.

The race of *Saxons* in Northern Germany still remained unconverted. Two English missionaries, brothers by the name of *Ewald*, had suffered martyrdom among them, in the first half of the eighth century. The Saxons were especially averse to Christianity, because it conflicted with their savage, warlike nature, and because it came to them through the feared and hated Franks. *Charlemagne*,¹ who felt strongly impelled to bring all the races which he conquered under the influence of Christianity, had made special efforts, since the year 768, to subdue and convert the Saxons. But he proceeded too much in accordance with the principles of a victorious conqueror, and the nature of his proud and passionate spirit, and paid too little regard to the wise counsel of *Alcuin*, who would attain the desired object only by the method of instruction and conviction; so that Christianity, for the Saxons, must necessarily be an almost wholly external affair, to be received only because the great king of the Franks thus willed. As often, consequently, as they succeeded in throwing off the Frankish yoke, they broke up the existing Christian institutions, and it was only after a thirty years' conflict (773–803), which ended with the peace concluded at Seltz in 804, that Charlemagne could reckon upon a permanent establishment of his rule, and of the Christian church among them. The founding of charitable institutions, churches, monasteries, and bishoprics,² which now began, at least prepared for the spiritual conversion of the coming generations, and was a guaranty of a permanent result at some future day. At the same time, the Saxons were not without some excellent Christian teachers. *Ludger*, a Friesland monk, and pupil of Gregory and Alcuin, labored for seven years among the Frieslanders, until the revolt of the Saxon chief Wittekind, in 782, compelled him to leave. He went first to Rome, and then to the abbey of Monte

¹ For his biography see *Eginhardus De vita et gestis Caroli Magni*, in *Pertz Monumenta T. II*; republished also at Hamb., 1839. A modern biography of him has been written by Hegewisch, 1791.

² Between 780 and 814, bishoprics were established at Osnabruck, Münster, Paderborn, Minden, Bremen, Verden, and Seligenstadt.

Cassino for purposes of study. After the defeat of Wittekind, in 785, he returned to his missionary labors; first among the Frieslanders upon the island of Heligoland, where he was eminently successful, and afterwards among the Saxons in the region which afterwards constituted the bishopric of Munster. Here he labored with unwearied zeal up to the very day of his death, March 26th, 809.¹ Another noteworthy missionary to the Saxons was the English presbyter *Willehad*. His first labors, also, were among the Frieslanders; but in 780 Charlemagne assigned him a missionary field among the Saxons, in the region which afterwards became the bishopric of Bremen. Here he labored with distinguished success, and died Nov. 8th, 789, the first bishop of Bremen.²

Charlemagne also, made some attempts towards the subjugation of the pagan *Slaves* in Northern and Eastern Germany. He had planned the establishment of an archbishopric at Hamburg, which should be a centre for Slavic missions, but his death, in 814, prevented the execution of his design.

§ 98.

CHRISTIANITY IN ASIA.

In Asia the knowledge of Christianity, in this period, extended as far as to *China*. The germs of the gospel had gone to this country in the preceding centuries, through the connection with the Eastern part of the Roman empire, and the Christian clergy seem to have been confounded with the priests of the foreign religion of Fo, which had come into China from India. According to an ancient inscription,³ a

¹ See his life by his second successor Alfrid, in Pertz Monumenta II; also compare Neander Church History III. 79 sq.

² See his life by Anshar, in Pertz Monumenta II; also compare Neander Church History III. p. 80.

³ Composed in Chinese and Syriac, and graven upon a stone, which was discovered in 1625, and sent to Europe by Jesuit missionaries. It purports to be dated in 781. *Deguignes* and *Remusat* maintain its genuineness; *Neumann* considers it spurious.

Nestorian missionary named *Olopuen*, from the region of Tatsin lying upon the western border of China, where Nestorian churches then existed, came into China in 636, and was received with great respect, even by Chinese emperors. For a series of years after 698, the Christians in China are said to have been persecuted, but after the year 713 were permanently favored. According to another oriental tradition of the ninth century,¹ the Nestorian patriarch *Timotheus* (778–820) sent missionaries from the monastery of Bethabe in Mesopotamia, among the tribes around the Caspian Sea, and still farther, to East India and China.

Thus the foundations of the Christian Church were laid even in China, though the purity of the seed sown, and the ripeness of the fruit gathered, are not beyond doubt and question.

¹ *Assemani Bibliotheca orientalis* T. III. P. I. p. 158 sq

SECTION SECOND.

Church Polity.

§ 99.

RELATION OF THE CHURCH TO THE STATE.

Ever since the fourth century, the church and the state within the Roman empire had stood in most intimate relations; and this same connection passed over to the newly converted races, carrying with it essentially the same form of church polity and discipline. Moreover, as it was natural that the church should form and mould the entire civilization of these barbaric populations, so it was even necessary that it should curb with a strong hand their rude and passionate nature. Hence the influence of the church upon the state, during this period, was, in general, more important and positive than in the preceding, although the civil authority failing to discriminate accurately between the province of the church and that of the state, oftentimes disputed, with more violence than ever before, the claims of the church to independence and the right to exert a dominant influence over the whole social life. Hence, notwithstanding the closeness of the connection between the two, there was a constant resistance on the part of the church, to the assumption and abuse of power on the part of the state.

The influence of the civil power upon the church appeared most plainly in the appointment of bishops, in ecclesiastical legislation, and in the province of ecclesiastical law generally, — an influence that was more particularly defined and regulated by Charlemagne, and was greatest in the *Frankish* kingdom, and least in that of *Spain*.

The *Frankish* kings, accustomed to bestow all offices in their empire according to their pleasure, supposed that they could *grant bishoprics* with equal arbitrariness, and might even sell them. Neither the earnest remonstrances of *Gregory the Great* (Epp. lib. xi. p. 58 sq.), nor the decisions of Frankish synods in the sixth and seventh centuries,¹ sufficed to repress this disorder, over which *Boniface* had frequently to lament. *Charlemagne*, among the measures which he adopted for bringing order into the distracted church in his empire, restored the regular method of electing bishops, reserving to the prince only the right of ratifying the choice of the church and laity. Sometimes, indeed, he himself nominated capable persons to the office of bishop, but his earnest and genuine interest in the welfare of the church prevented this from working any injury.

The civil power sought to obtain a similar influence, in the Frankish empire, over *ecclesiastical legislation*. No ecclesiastical ordinance had legal validity, unless it had proceeded from the general assembly of the empire, and had been promulgated under royal authority; and no synod could assemble for ecclesiastical legislation without the knowledge and consent of the king. By this means, it had come to pass, that the provincial synods, held under the presidency of a bishop, had gradually gone into desuetude in the Frankish empire, until they were revived by Boniface in the eighth century, and the imperial synods had become completely merged in the general assembly of the empire, — whereby, indeed, the church was enabled to exert a more direct influence upon the civil legislation. But this influence again was somewhat restricted by Charlemagne. He divided the members of the general assembly of the empire into two classes, the secular and the spiritual, (the latter composed of bishops and abbots), and, provided that all ecclesiastical

¹ A synod in Paris in 557 decided that the election of bishops must be made by the churches and clergy, subject to the concurrence of the provincial bishops and the metropolitan, and that a bishop constituted by a merely royal mandate was not to be recognized. This decision was renewed by a Paris synod in 615, with the additional clause that the prince might inquire into the fitness of the candidate, with the power of approval or of rejection.

matters should be examined by the clerical division (the general affairs of the church falling to the bishops, and those relating to the monasteries to the abbots), and all civil matters by the secular class. The decisions of both classes were then to be published under the royal authority. In the *Spanish-Gothic* kingdom, on the other hand, where the king sought to maintain his wavering power by ecclesiastical aid, the church exerted a greater influence upon civil and secular affairs; for it was made a legal arrangement, through the council of Toledo in 694, that at the great diet of the realm, ecclesiastical concerns should be first discussed for three days by the clerical members alone, and then secular affairs should be canvassed by the clerical and lay members together.

In respect to the *exemption of the clergy from the public burdens* (*munera publica*) resting upon all free citizens, they were free, in the Frankish empire, from the obligation to serve in the army. The bishops and abbots were, indeed, obliged, in proportion to the amount of property which they held officially, to furnish a certain contingent to the army of the sovereign; yet they were not under obligation to accompany it themselves in person, though they did so from preference, and with too much frequency, until a wise statute of Charlemagne, in 801, forbade this.¹ One consequence of this statute, which absolutely forbade a clergyman to appear in battle, was that the clergy began to be taken from the class of *bondmen*, who were not under obligation as were all freemen, to do military service. The effect of this was to elevate the condition of bondmen, in whose behalf voices had already been raised in previous periods, and to bring the whole subject and institution of slavery into the light of Christianity.²

¹ This statute (Mansi Concill. T. XIII. p. 1054) forbids that any priest shall take part in battle, but provides that two or three bishops, with some priests to assist them, shall accompany the army to perform spiritual functions.

² The New Testament did not violently abolish slavery, yet represented the master and slave as perfectly equal before God. Perceiving with more or less clearness that the spirit of Christianity must transform this relation, *Constantine*

The right of *asylum* in the church edifice passed over undiminished to the new Christian populations, and was of great benefit in the rude violence of the period. The only modification was that made by the wise law of Charlemagne, in 779, that murderers who had taken refuge in the church edifice should not be furnished with the means of subsistence.

§ 100.

MONACHISM AND THE CLERGY.

Monks, for the most part, had carried the gospel to the barbaric races, and had become their instructors in all branches of civilization and culture. It was natural therefore that monachism should be held in high veneration among them; and all the more, when the laborious and ascetic monks came into comparison with a frequently barbarized clergy. When, moreover, rapacious nobles or violent bishops laid hands upon the property of the monasteries, the fruit of the hard labor of monks, princes and sometimes bishops themselves, especially the Roman bishops, gave to the monasteries certain privileges for their security, yet not exempting them from episcopal jurisdiction and oversight. *Fulda*, the favorite cloister of Boniface, was the first exception in this latter respect.

The authority and influence of the monks increased at the expense of that of the clergy, and not without great fault on the part of the latter. In several countries, particularly in

decreed that the manumission of slaves within the church should be legally valid, and not a few Christians freed their slaves in consequence. *Chrysostom*, *Isidore of Pelusium*, *Gregory the Great*, *John Eleemosynarius*, patriarch of Alexandria 606–616 (see *Acta Sanctorum*, Jan. T. II. p. 510). *Maximus* the statesman and monk († 662), *Theodore Studites* the head of a monastery in Constantinople († 826), and others, declared distinctly that slavery is in its nature incompatible with the spirit of Christianity. Compare *Neander Church History*, I. 267; III. 98, sq.

the Frankish empire, the clergy had lapsed into a very barbarized condition by participation in war, hunting, and the like, and by reason of their lack of education, and their unrestrained worldly life. Hence the thought occurred to some of the more excellent of the bishops, of a reformation of the clergy by some approximation to the flourishing monastic system; and a pious bishop, *Chrodegang*, of Mentz († 766), attempted, about the year 760, to accomplish what Augustine had sought to do in Africa, and many Italian and Gallic bishops in the sixth and 7th centuries. He sketched, for the most part after the model of the Benedictine regulations (Ancient Church, § 74), a code of rules (*Canon*, hence those who followed it were *Canonici*) for his clergy, which obligated them to live in a common edifice (monasterium), under the immediate oversight of a common head; to partake of a common meal; to engage at certain hours (*horae canonicae*) in common prayer and worship prolonged far into the night; and to meet, at stated times, for a common examination of a portion of scripture (*capitulum*, hence the meetings were called *capitula*), and for the administration of exhortation or rebuke, as the case might require. This rule of Chrodegang,¹ having been authorized as a whole by Charlemagne, received some alterations, and was made ecclesiastically valid for the Frankish empire, at the Council of Aix in 816, and was then known under the name of the *regula Aquisgranensis*.

The district of a bishop in these newly Christianized regions, was too extensive to allow of the entire prevention of ecclesiastical abuses. Considering the wide reach of his diocese, and the rude, untutored character of his church members, the official oversight of the bishop needed to be very watchful and earnest in every place; and yet the fact was not seldom far otherwise. Besides this, there were some abuses which greatly endangered the good order of the church, and required an energetic opposition on the part of the bishops. The old ecclesiastical law, that every cler-

¹ Found in *Mansi* T. XIV. p. 313.

gyman should be ordained over a particular local church, and that no *ordinationes absolutae* should take place, was of necessity oftentimes transgressed in the ordination of missionaries. Taking advantage of this departure from the common rule, unworthy persons were frequently ordained by selfish and designing bishops, without reference to any particular charge. They then wandered about the country (*clerici vagi*), notwithstanding ecclesiastical prohibition, performing clerical functions from house to house. Oftentimes they constituted a species of inferior court-clergy to the Frankish kings, who, partly in imitation of the Byzantine emperors and partly by reason of their migratory camp-court, maintained their own separate ecclesiastical establishment, at the head of which stood the arch-chaplain (*archicapellanus*). This example of the sovereign was imitated by the nobles and knights, who built private chapels in their castles, and appointed their own priests. The consequence of all this was, that a body of irresponsible clergymen came into existence, who sought to make themselves entirely free from the oversight of the bishops, and whose labors tended to empty the parish churches. For these and other reasons, the custom of *episcopal visitation*, which had previously prevailed as an optional matter, was made obligatory upon the bishop, by the Spanish council of *Braga*, in 572, and by the synod of *Cloveshove* in 747 it was decreed that the visitation should be an annual one. In furtherance of the same object, the peculiar arrangement of *Sends* (*Send*, synodus) arose in the Frankish church. These were ecclesiastical courts, which the bishops held annually in every town in their diocese, for the purpose of inquiring into the moral and religious condition of the churches, and to administer punishment, which was to some extent corporal, upon those who were found worthy of it. In this examination, the bishops were assisted by seven Deans (*Decani*) from each community, whom they appointed and put under oath for this purpose. In order to lighten the burden of such supervision, many bishops now divided their dioceses into smaller districts, which were placed under the care of an *Archpresbyter*,

whose influence, however, was far from equalling that of the the *Archdeacon*.

Only the purely episcopal constitution obtained a general influence and validity among these newly Christianized nations. It is true that the *Metropolitan* constitution had passed over into the new churches so far as the theory of polity was concerned. But not only particular political circumstances,—as, for example, when a bishop fell under a different political ruler from that of his metropolitan, or under a ruler at enmity with that of the metropolitan,—but the difficulty of adapting the Old-Roman polity to the state of things in the new Frankish and German empires, in which there were no properly metropolitan centres, contributed to the dissolution in many countries of the metropolitan constitution. In this manner the authority and influence of the bishop depended very much upon his personal characteristics; and it was not without success that the independent Frankish bishops resisted the endeavors of Boniface to restore again the power of the metropolitan, while at the same time his power would naturally diminish, in proportion as the authority of one universal Primate was gradually rising in the Western church.

take

§ 101.

FORMATION OF THE PAPACY.

Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum (the legal precedents of the Roman See, collected about 715) ed. Holstein Rom. 1658. *Liber Pontificalis* ss. vitæ Romanorum Pontificum a Petro apostolo usque ad Nicol. I. ed. Blanchini, Rom. 1718–35, also published in Muratori *Rerum Ital. scriptt.* T. III. *Platina* *De vitis pontificum Romanorum*, Col. 1479, Lugd. 1645. *Blondel* *Traité historique de la primauté en l'église*, Genève 1641. *Salmasius* *De primatu papæ*, Lugd. 1645. *Cyprian* *Überzeugende Belehrung vom Ursprung und Wachstum des Pabsthums*, Frkf. 1735. *Walch* *Entwurf einer vollständiger Historie der römischen Pabste*, Gött. 1758. *Nehr* *Geschichte des Pabstthums*, Leipzig 1801. *Bower* *History of the Popes*, Lond. 1750–54.

Maimbourg (Papal) *Traité historique de l'établissement de l'église de Rome*, 1685. Pagi (Papal) *Breviarium illustriora pontificum gesta complectens*, Lucc. 1724. Katerkamp (Papal) *Ueber den Primat des Apost. Petrus*, Münst. 1820. Hussey *The Rise of the Papal power*, Oxford 1851.

We have already seen (Ancient Church § 71) that in the preceding period the Roman bishops were succeeding, more and more, in establishing the primacy of their church over all others, upon the ground of the divine right of the Apostle Peter and of a supposed succession to his authority, rather than upon any decrees of councils or imperial statutes. They were still more successful, in this period, in employing the favorable circumstances of the time, particularly their own influence upon the newly converted German races, for the increase of their power, and were aided by the insight and sagacity of both secular and ecclesiastical advocates of their claims. Moreover, it seemed as if the struggle for the independence of the church, in opposition to the abuses of the civil power, could be successful only in case the bishops, who were so dependent upon the princes, ceased to work in a separate and individual capacity, and some one of their number, standing as the head of the entire ecclesiastical body, and prosecuting his own preconceived plan independently of the princes, should engage in the contest with them. Besides this, it did not escape even a careless observer, how very much was frequently accomplished, in times of general political and ecclesiastical confusion, towards the maintenance and restoration of order, by the well-known energy and wisdom of a Roman bishop, — such an one, for example, as *Gregory the Great*, who stands at the entrance of the Middle Ages: a man as mild and gentle towards the weak, as he was earnest and severe towards the delinquent; defending with glowing zeal, and with full conviction, the rights of the Roman church as the *Cathedra Petri*, and yet not disposed to infringe in the least upon the rights of other churches; sincerely believing that the final guidance of the whole church was committed to him, and yet very far, in the temper of his mind, from vain ambition and worldly avarice. This energy and efficiency

of the Roman bishops, coupled with the ancient reputation of Rome for orthodoxy in doctrine, which, in general, was still maintained during this period, could not fail to enhance everywhere the authority of the Roman church. Still, the establishment of a decided supremacy of the Romish bishops was contradictory to the theory and constitution of the church, as held up to this time, and it was only gradually and mostly after the eighth century, that the actual victory of the former over the latter took place, and a new ecclesiastical system, that of the *Papacy*,¹ came into existence, which was from this time onward clothed with the not inconsiderable secular power of the Romish see.

The relations of the Papacy to the churches and governments of different countries were quite various.

With the *Greek emperors*, who since 554 had regained dominion over Italy,² the Roman bishops at first stood in very close relations; but the feeble hold which their power had upon Italy, compelled them to concede many important privileges to the latter, as the richest and most powerful proprietors, and those who possessed the greatest influence over the people. On the other hand, the Roman bishops regarded themselves as vassals of the Greek emperors, who confirmed their election, to whom, upon entering upon office, they sent their deputies (*Apocrisarios*), and from whom they had to endure great external humiliation, even as late as the seventh century, during the Monothelite controversy. It was not until the close of this period that the Roman bishops, partly upon occasion of the Image controversy, but chiefly by means of their closer connection with the Frankish empire, succeeded in emancipating themselves from the supremacy of the Greek emperors.

The jealousy between the patriarchs of Rome, and those

¹ The name *papa* (*πάπας*), which previously had been given to all bishops, was more and more confined to the Roman patriarchs, after the second half of the sixth century.

² After the dissolution of the West-Roman empire in 476, Italy became a kingdom of the Heruli under Odoacer until 493, and then of the Ostrogoths until 554.

of *Constantinople*, gradually increased, until, at length, the points of contact and collision were removed, by the total separation of the Eastern from the Western church. The relation of the Roman bishops to the Greek emperors had, from the very first, conditioned their relation to the Constantinopolitan patriarchs. In proportion as the bishops of Rome were dependent upon the Greek emperors, the patriarchs of Constantinople were the more unwilling to concede to them a supreme authority; and, at a later day, owing to the altered state of political relations, the East and the West were too far separated to allow any inclination upon the part of the patriarchs of Constantinople to regard the Roman see with much veneration. At the beginning of this period, a controversy arose respecting the authority of each church. *John Jejunator*, the patriarch of Constantinople (585-595), at a council in 587, had assumed to himself the title of ἐπίσκοπος οἰκουμενικός, a name which previously had been only occasionally adopted by the Constantinopolitan and other patriarchs. In this, the Roman bishop *Pelagius II.* (578-590) thought he saw an intention upon the part of the patriarch of Constantinople to make himself supreme bishop of the church universal. Pelagius's protest against this was continued still more earnestly by *Gregory the Great*,¹ before the Greek emperor *Mauricius*, as well as the patriarch of Constantinople himself; nevertheless the title was not given up, but on the contrary was constantly used by the see of Constantinople, after the reign of the the usurper and murderer *Phocas* (602-610), who had favored the claims of the Roman see from political and personal considerations. Gregory, on the other hand, called himself "Servus servorum Dei," though the popes who succeeded soon associated with this appellation, the other and more ingenuous title of universal bishop. A decision of the council *Quinsextum* at Constantinople, in 692 (see § 106). that the patriarchs of Constantinople were equal in

¹ Gregory claimed the supremacy for the Roman church over that of Constantinople. "De Constantinopolitana ecclesia quis eam dubitet apostolicæ sedi esse subjectam"? Epp. IX. 12.

authority with those of Rome, though recognized as authoritative by the Oriental church, was too late to have any effect in diminishing the authority of the Roman popes in the West.

The Roman bishops stood in unpleasant relations to the *Lombards*, who had invaded Italy in 568, partly because they were Arians, and partly because their progress in Italy was disadvantageous to the East-Roman empire, with which the Roman see was now so closely connected. Still, the Arian Lombards were inclined to a certain reverence for the Roman bishops as the successors of Peter, and after the transition of Queen *Theodelind*, in 587, and her son King *Adelwald* (616–626), to the Catholic church, and particularly after the reign of King *Grimoald* (†671), the intensity of their opposition to Rome diminished, although it never entirely disappeared, and at last broke forth again in a most violent manner. Of the other Italian churches, only that of *Ravenna* was able to assert its independence, for some time longer.

With the *Spanish Church*, the Roman see had already come into connection in the preceding period. After the settlement of the Arian Goths in Spain, this connection was weakened so far as extent of country was concerned; but the oppressed party of Old-Spanish Catholics were so much the more intent upon keeping up the connection, and after the transition of the Gothic-Spanish King *Reccared* to the Catholic church, in 589, they strengthened and extended it once more to its original limits. *Gregory the Great* granted the pallium, as the symbol of primacy, to Leander, bishop of Seville, and successfully interposed his judicial authority, in behalf of two Spanish bishops who had been deposed from office by a Spanish noble. Afterwards, indeed, upon a special occasion, King *Witiza* (701–710) forbade any appeal to the bishop of Rome; but the discussion thus commenced between Spain and Rome was only momentary, owing to the incursion of the Saracens which soon followed in 711, and which the pope could easily represent as a judgment of God sent to punish an invasion of ecclesiastical order.

The *English* Church, which had owed its origin to Rome, from the very first entered into friendly relations with the Romish see. Frequent pilgrimages of English nobles to Rome, to visit the graves of saints, drew the tie still closer, and in 726 *Ina* king of Wessex and Sussex, and afterwards in 794 *Offa* king of Mercia and East Anglia, levied a yearly tax upon the people for the support of an English foundation at Rome. This afterwards became a universal tax throughout England, — the so-called *Denarius Sancti Petri* or Peter's pence, — from which the later popes deduced their claim to spiritual and temporal supremacy over the kingdom.

The connection between the Roman church and the *Frankish empire* eventually became a very close and important one. In the sixth century, the metropolitan bishop of Arles obtained the honor of being made a vicar of St. Peter, at the instance of the Frankish kings; the relationship between the two parties was still more strengthened by *Gregory the Great*, who frequently animadverted by letters upon Frankish abuses; and lastly, after an interruption for a long time of the intercourse, it was completely restored again by the German *Boniface*, who had, as we have seen, established the supremacy of the pope in Germany. The connection between France and Rome now became so close and firm that *Pepin*, the Frankish mayor of the palace, justified, before the people and his own conscience, his assumption of the royal title, and the deposition in 722 of *Childeric III.*, the last of the Merovian kings, by the warranty of pope *Zacharias* (741–752). After the pontificate of *Zacharias*, the connection became still more close and intimate, so that it took the place of the old relation between Rome and the Romano-Grecian empire. The pope now acquired a domain at the expense of the Lombard and Greek rulers, and the Frankish kings were established upon their throne through his influence; but the connection thus formed was destined to be the cause of much collision and conflict between both church and state in the future. *Stephen II* (752–757), the successor of *Zacharias*, was more and more

oppressed by the Lombard king *Aistulph*, who had already conquered the Exarchate of Ravenna belonging to the Greek empire. Since the East-Roman empire afforded him no assistance, he applied, in person, to Pepin, in 754, for aid. Pepin, who on this occasion received unction from the pope, forced the Lombards, after two campaigns in 754, 755, to surrender all the provinces they had conquered, and, declaring that he had not fought for the Greeks but for the Apostle Peter, through his court-chaplain laid down upon the tomb of the apostle a document wherein he gave over to the Roman church the territories he had conquered from the Lombards. This was the commencement of the temporal power of the Papacy.¹ New incursions of the Lombards under *Desiderius*, led Pope *Hadrian I.* (772–795) to ask assistance from *Charlemagne*. This powerful prince destroyed the Lombard kingdom in 744, and through the firmer establishment of the Frankish rule in Italy, the connection between the Roman see and the Frankish empire assumed a permanent and well-defined form. *Charlemagne* confirmed and enlarged the donation of Pepin, and in return received from the hands of *Leo III.* (795–816), on Christmas day, 809, in St. Peter's church at Rome, the crown of the Western Roman Empire. — From this time the last remains of the sovereignty of the Greek emperors over the Roman see disappeared. — But although the Roman bishops now possessed an acknowledged sovereignty within their own territory, they stood unmistakably in a sort of dependent relation to the Frankish empire. *Charlemagne* administered justice within the papal domains as well as within his own, and through his commissioners (*Missi*), who often did not hesitate to set the imperial interests in open conflict with the papal, exercised all his imperial rights in the city of Rome. Only in purely ecclesiastical matters did the empe-

¹ Orsi Della origine del dominio e della sovranità degli Rom. Pont. Rom. 1754. Sabbathier Sur l'origine de la puissance temporelle des Papes. à la Haye, 1765. Becker Ueber den Zeitpunkt der Veränderungen in der Oberh. über Rom. Lüb. 1769. For the documents, see Codex Carolinus in Cenni Monumenta dominationis pontificiae, Rom. 1760.

ror bow to the pope. Yet, with all his reverence for the church of St. Peter, and all his acknowledgment of the need of a visible unity of the church, and of the many excellences of the Roman ecclesiastical constitution, Charlemagne was far from yielding unconditional obedience to the spiritual power of the pope. He often followed the counsel of his more immediate spiritual advisers, in open contradiction to papal principles and claims; he did not send the ecclesiastical decisions of the general assembly of the empire to the pope, until he had first examined and approved them; and in one instance convened an ecclesiastical tribunal in reference to pope Leo III., which however rendered no decision, because the bishops refused to pass judgment upon their judge (Comp. Alcuini Epist. 92).

SECTION THIRD.

Christian Life and Worship.

§ 102.

CHRISTIAN LIFE AND CULTURE.

THE great masses of population who now bore the Christian name, were by no means all animated by the Christian spirit. On the contrary, many of the new converts still clung to their old pagan vices and practices, against which the system of *ecclesiastical discipline*, external in its character and containing the germ of dangerous doctrinal errors, could effect but little. The ecclesiastical statutes relating to penance had passed over into the Western churches,¹ along with the ancient system of polity and government; and many bishops and synods,—like *Theodulph* of Orleans about the year 800, and the synod of *Cloveshove* in 747 under the presidency of Cudbert archbishop of Canterbury and the influence of *Boniface*, and that of *Chalons* in 813,—did not fail to direct attention to the inward nature of real penitence, and to discriminate between absolution by the priest and forgiveness before God. But the majority of the clergy, on the contrary, imparted to the penitential discipline more and more of an outward character, while, at the same time, the new relations that were forming among the recently

¹ *Theodore* Archbishop of Canterbury, a Greek by birth (†690), made them known at the West by collecting them in his *Poenitentiale* (lib. poenitentialis). Compare *Wasserschleben Die Buszordnungen der abendländischen Kirche. Halle, 1851.*

Christianized nations operated injuriously upon the shaping of the theory of penance. As fines were very common among these populations, a *pecuniary mulct* was introduced into the discipline of the church, sometimes taking the place of other species of penance, and sometimes connected with them. This, at first, had for its object the ransom of captives, or the support of the poor, and was not intended to minister to self-indulgence, or to the notion that the forgiveness of sins could be obtained by money. But the rude condition of the people, or the unfitness of many of the clergy for their office, occasioned misconceptions, from which sprang the theory of indulgence, afterwards so demoralizing; so that the synod of *Cloveshove*, as early as the year 749, were called upon to combat the blasphemous notion that rich men could compound for their sins with money.

A merely outward profession of Christianity, under such circumstances, could contribute little towards the promotion of *Christian education*. Boniface only required of godchildren, that they should commit to memory the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer; and the misuse of the Scriptures, in opening them at random, particularly at the tombs of saints, and selecting a passage to be taken as an oracle, was not adapted to check the growing religious ignorance. This custom, *Charlemagne*, after the example of previous synods, felt bound to forbid.¹ It soon became a pressing necessity of the church to provide the means of a general Christian education. The attempt was made to meet this necessity by some single enterprising synods, and excellent bishops, — as, for example, the English synod of *Cloveshove* in 747, the synods of *Mayence*, *Arles*, and *Chalon* in 813, the canonical rule of *Chrodegang* (§ 100), the pastoral letter of *Theodulph* bishop of Orleans (†821), and the efforts of *Alcuin* and others at the court of *Charlemagne*. The first-mentioned synod enjoined upon bishops to preach the word in their diocesan visitation; and upon both bishops and abbots to provide for the instruction of children at school in the Scriptures. The synod of

¹ He ordered in the third capitulary of the year 789, "ut nullus in psalterio, vel in evangelio, vel in aliis rebus sortire praesumat."

Mayence ordered that upon Sundays and festival days there should be preaching in the vernacular language, in a plain manner intelligible to all. The synod of Arles made preaching obligatory upon all priests; and that of Chalons urged the founding of Christian schools, together with biblical exposition and preaching. Theodulph, in his pastoral letter, insisted upon frequent and careful discourse from the Scriptures; and in case this were not possible, upon some plain point in practical morality. Chrodegang's rule required preaching from a text of scripture, at least as often as twice in each month, in case it could not be done upon every Sunday and festival day; and Alcuin, in a letter to Charlemagne (Ep. 124), urges that not the bishops only, but the priests and deacons also, should preach. Yet, too many of the clergy were wanting in the right spirit, and intelligence, for the discharge of these duties¹; and even the enlightened zeal and energy of Charlemagne (§ 97) met with only a partial success in removing the evil. Following Alcuin's counsel (Epist. 9, 59, 124, 193), the emperor made special efforts to promote the study of the Bible among the clergy, and devoted much attention to the revision of the Latin translations of the Scriptures, which had become very corrupt owing to the barbarism of the time. Under his direction, also, *Paul Warnefried* (Paulus Diaconus² † 799), a learned ecclesiastic of his court, trained in the abbey of Monte Cassino, made a collection of sermons for every Sunday and festival day in the year, from the writings of the Fathers — chiefly Augustine and Gregory the Great.³

¹ The Cloveshove synod was content with requiring from the ordinary clergy, that they should translate and explain in the vernacular, the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Liturgy; and Boniface himself was satisfied with their putting the formula of renunciation at baptism and of confession of sins, in the vernacular tongue.

² The author of a work in six books, *De gestis Longobardorum*, extending to 744.

³ This *Homiliarium*, published under Charlemagne's authority, contributed to the general diffusion of that arrangement of biblical texts and lessons which prevailed in the Roman church

§ 103.

CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

No object was regarded of more importance by *Charlemagne*, than the transformation of the rude worship of the church, in all its parts, and particularly of *church music*.¹ Gregory the Great had already paved the way for this latter. The beautiful *Ambrosian* psalmody, with its melodious movement, rythmical intonation, and antiphonies, had been carried to an extreme, and become secularized. Gregory the Great substituted, in the place of it, the so-called *cantus Romanus*, or *cantus firmus*, which did not permit of the *Ambrosian* clearness and animation, nor the responses of the congregation; but, without rythm or beat, moved along with a slow, simple, solemn, and uniform monotony, like monkish recitative, only with richer modulations, and a more elaborate art. At the same time, he took it from the congregation, and gave it over, in priestly exclusiveness, to a well-trained choir of clerical singers (hence *cantus choralis*, choral), for whose training he founded the first school for ecclesiastical music at Rome. Gregory's influence had given currency to this species of psalmody, in one part of the West; and now the zeal of *Charlemagne* caused it to be introduced throughout nearly all western Christendom. The emperor brought singers from Rome, and founded musical schools first at *Mentz* and *Soissons*, and afterwards at *Orleans*, *Lyons*, and *Paris*, which were devoted exclusively to the teaching and cultivation of the *Gregorian* chant. He adopted stringent measures to preserve this music in its purity, and punished every deviation and corruption with imprisonment and exile.² Nevertheless, all this strictness did not prevent the *cantus firmus*, though supported by the

¹ The singing in the German churches, in particular, resembled the howling of wild beasts; and in France it was not much better.

² At Milan, he caused all the remaining copies of the *Ambrosian* chant to be bought up and destroyed.

organ,¹ which had recently been invented, from falling into disuse.

Charlemagne's zeal for music, although against his intention and wish, brought an element with it that was prejudicial to culture. The *Latin language* had already been introduced into the public worship of most of the Western Churches; because, first, in many of the great towns it was better understood than the native language; secondly, it was the language of the missionaries, and, lastly, the language of the recently converted races was thought to be too rude to be employed in the service of Christ. Charlemagne endeavored, in various ways, to promote the employment of the native tongue in public worship;² but the establishment of schools for singing, by Roman teachers, contributed to render the use of the Latin language more and more indispensable in public worship. The Latin liturgy necessarily hindered a spiritual worship in the people who did not understand it, and thus superstition could more easily take root.

¹ The use of the organ in church music, began about the middle of the eighth century. It was introduced into the French church from the East, though it was never used in the Greek church. In 757, the emperor Constantinus Copronymus made a present of one to Pipin; and again in 787, Constantine Michael sent a second to Charlemagne. The organ was better adapted to the Gregorian music, than to the Ambrosian. Its invention was attributed to a holy monk, who, according to the legend, was permitted to hear the song of the angels. From France, the use of the organ spread generally through the Western church. Lewis the Pious introduced it at Aix la Chapelle in 822.

The invention of the organ cannot, however, be regarded as dating from the 8th century, or as having originated in the Greek church. Tertullian (*De Anima*, c. 14) attributes the invention of the water-organ (*hydraulus*) to Archimedes († B.C. 212). Vitruvius and Pliny attribute it to Ctesebus of Alexandria, about 120 B.C.; and according to Suetonius (*Vit. Neronis*, c. 41), Nero amused himself with such music. The wind-organ was in existence in the time of Augustine (*In Psal.* 56); and, according to Cassiodorus (*In Psal.* 150), the organ was in his day constructed with rows of pipes, tier above tier. MÜLLER: *Sendschr. von Orgeln*. 1718; CHRYSANDER: *Historische Nachricht*. 1755.

² In a capitulary issued at Frankfort, he ordered "ut nullus credad, quod nonnisi in tribus linguis deus orandus sit, quia in omni lingua deus adoratur, et homo exauditur, si iusta petierit."

This superstitious tendency appeared specially in the administration of the sacrament of the *Lord's Supper*. In the preceding period, the notion had been forming more and more that this sacrament is a sacrificial act of the priest, and an *oblatio pro mortuis*. This view now became still more general; and Gregory the Great, in particular, who definitely fixed the *doctrine* of a sacrifice in the supper, gave practical currency to it, by imaginative and fanciful descriptions of its nature and efficacy.¹ From this time onward, a power was ascribed to the sacrament of the supper to deliver the souls of those who had died in an imperfect condition, from the purifying punishment of the *ignis purgatorius*²; and in the eighth century, private masses (*missae privatae* sc. *solitariae*) came into use, offered by the officiating priest alone by himself, and with a prevalent reference to the doctrine of purgatorial fire. Nevertheless, as late as the ninth century, bishops like *Theodulph*, and synods like that of Mayence in 813, declared against the latter practice, and exhorted the laity to a more frequent participation in the communion.

The *veneration of saints*, and of their reliques, in this period, when so much of heathenism was concealed under a Christian garb, assumed more and more the character of extreme superstition. Gregory bishop of Tours († 595),

¹ The present Roman Catholic liturgy for the sacrament, the mass service, takes its origin from him.

² The doctrine of a purgatorial fire took the place of the doctrine, previously held, of a Hades or intermediate place of unhappiness, in which souls that had not truly believed in Christ, were believed to be kept till the day of judgment. Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catecheses* XV. 21) defends the doctrine of a purgatorial fire; and Augustine (*De Civitate Dei* XX. 25) finds it in the description of the last judgment by the prophet Malachi (*Mal.* iii. 1-6). But he *confines it to the righteous*: the purgation being intended to complete the work of grace, and cleanse away the last remains of indwelling corruption. In the thirteenth chapter of the twenty-first book of the *De Civitate*, Augustine combats the doctrine of those "qui putant, criminosos supplicia post mortem causa purgationis adhiberi." Gregory the Great (*Dial.* IV. 49) describes the purgatorial state as the place of those who have become, while upon earth, capable of the heavenly blessedness, but who have deceased with imperfection cleaving to them. — Compare the account given of the intermediate state, and of a preparatory cleansing, in the "Vision of one from the dead" related by Bede, *Eccl. History* V. 12. *TRANS.*

nearly two centuries after the death of his predecessor Martin (Ancient Church § 68), testified to wonderful cures still performed at his tomb; and the belief of the church in the continuance of miraculous agencies, steadily became more credulous, and indiscriminating. Nevertheless, Charlemagne, in the year 794, published a capitulary, in opposition to an immoderate multiplication of the number of saints, and their miracle-chapels; and also, in opposition to an excessive estimate of *pilgrimages* to holy places, many enlightened voices were raised, like those of Alcuin, Theodulph, and the Council of Chalons in 813. In the Greek church, the Sunday succeeding Pentecost had long been observed as the *Feast of All Martyrs*; in the Western church, the gift, by the Greek emperor Phocas to the Roman bishop Boniface IV., of the Roman Pantheon, to be the church of Mary and All Saints, now gave occasion for establishing the *Feast of All Saints*, which was observed on Nov. 1.

In harmony with this tendency to saint worship, the churches now vied with each other in lauding the *Virgin Mary*. In the fifth century, the *Feast of the Annunciation* (Lady Day¹), commemorative of the angelic greeting (Luke i. 26, 19) began to be observed; at first at different times, and afterwards uniformly upon the 25th of March, in order to bring it into natural connection with Christmas, which was now observed on the 25th of December. In the sixth century, the *Feast of the Purification* (Candlemas, Feb. 2) was established in the West, with allusion to Luke ii. 22. This festival corresponded to one already in existence in the Eastern church, — the festum occursus, ἐορτὴ τῆς ὑπάντης, — which was commemorative of the presentation of the infant Christ in the temple (Luke ii. 25, 29). To these two principal festivals relating to Mary, a third was now added, the *Feast of the Assumption* (Aug. 15), founded upon the legend that when Mary lay upon her death-bed, Christ with his angels appeared, and committed her soul to

¹ Bernard styles it, *radix omnium festorum*.

the archangel Gabriel, and took her body away in a cloud (Gregory of Tours, *De gloria martyrum* I. 4). The *Feast of the Nativity* of Mary (Sept. 8), we find in the Eastern church towards the end of the seventh century ; but not in the Western until later. The establishment of these festivals was the fertile root of the rapidly-growing Mariolatry that marks the history of the Mediaeval Church.

There were other festivals, which had an origin before this period, but which did not until now obtain a universal prevalence. *Michaelmas*, or the feast of the angels, was observed on the 29th of September, in commemoration of the communion between the church militant and the angelic world enlisted in their behalf. The *Feast of the Advent*, to commemorate the future coming of Christ, was observed in connection with Christmas ; and the emperor Herodius established the *Feast of the Elevation of the Cross* — *festum exaltationis* (Sept. 14) — in memory of the recovery of the cross from the Persians, and its restoration to Jerusalem.

SECTION FOURTH.

History of Doctrine.

CHAPTER FIRST.

THEOLOGY AND CONTROVERSIES.

§ 104.

THEOLOGY IN THE WEST.

THE Occidental theology, at the beginning of this period, was concentrated in the great Roman bishop Gregory I., who stands at the mid point between the declining Christianity of the Roman world, and the rising Christianity of the Germanic races. *Gregory the Great*¹ was born at Rome, about 540, of a senatorial family, and received an education in accordance with his birth and position. First a praetor at Rome, he became a monk in his fortieth year, in one of the six cloisters which he had himself founded. He was then made one of the seven deacons of the church of Rome, by Pelagius II., who also sent him to Constantinople as his deputy. Afterwards, he became the abbot of his cloister, and finally bishop of Rome in 590, where he died in 604. Distinguished for a sagacious and energetic administration of his high office, as well as for learning, sincere piety, and success in his pastoral labors, Gregory concludes the series of those church teachers who are espe-

¹ Paulus Warnefridus († 799) *De vita S. Gregorii Papae*; Johannes Diaconus (875) *Vita S. Gregorii* (both contained in the Benedictine edition of Gregory's Works); Neander *Church History* III. 141 sq.; Lau Gregor I. der Groze; Böhringer *Die Kirche Christi* Bd. I. Abth. 6; Wiggers *De Greg. magni ejusque placitis anthropol. comm.*

cially denominated the Church Fathers. Through his writings, he exerted a great, yet not in every respect salutary, influence upon the faith and sentiments of the whole Western church. As a theologian, formed by the study of Augustine, he not only transmitted into succeeding centuries the Augustinian doctrine of grace in its milder and more unspeculative form, but also propagated both of the two tendencies that appear in Augustine: the inward and profoundly Christian, and the more outward, sensuous, and ecclesiastical. He occasioned the development of such sensuous features in mediaeval Catholicism as the offering of the mass, and the doctrine of purgatory; and by his treatment of the sacraments, as well as his views of continued miraculous power in the church, nourished the growing superstition of the age. At the same time, he always subordinated the external miracle to the inward imparting of Divine grace, and, in opposition to the notion of an *opus operatum*, insisted with earnestness and energy upon a morality that rests upon a living faith. He exerted a similar influence upon the future, by his theological and practical labors. As a bishop, he considered it his duty to devote the most careful attention to the external affairs of the church; yet he regarded the immediately spiritual part of his calling as the most important, and took most pleasure in it; and although he was deeply interested in the liturgical and lyrical parts of worship (Comp. § 103), still he regarded preaching and the instruction of the people in the scriptures, as one of the most important duties of a priest (Epp. I. 25). He urged upon the clergy the importance and the duty of close study. At the same time he required that it should be only sacred study, — the study of the Holy Scriptures (Comp. In Ezech. hom. II. lib. II.; Epp. IV. 51), — denouncing, particularly, in one instance, the study of grammar and the ancient classics under the tuition of a bishop (Epp. IX. 54). Of all these theological and practical labors of Gregory, his own writings¹ give a clear and vivid picture.

¹ There are extant: The *Moralium sive expositionum in Jobum libri XXXV.*;

After the age of Gregory, and during the various storms and distractions that occurred in the West, genuine theological culture, for which the newly-converted populations were unripe, naturally became more rare; and it was only in particular countries, as Ireland, England, Spain, Italy, and France that the seeds of theological science were preserved, and the remainders of the old theology were propagated.¹

The *Irish* cloisters were resorts for the study of the Bible, and the Church Fathers, and at a later day became the seminaries whence issued the speculative and dialectical tendency of the Middle Ages, the scholastic.

England owed its theological science to intercourse with Ireland,² and also to a zealous propagator of Grecian learning, the Cilician monk *Theodorus*,³ appointed by papal authority archbishop of Canterbury († 690). Still more was due to the influence of *Bede*,⁴ justly called the Venerable († 735), the most learned man of his age, a presbyter and monk in the united cloister of Peter and Paul at Wearmouth and Yarrow in Northumberland, who, by his important writings,⁵ and numerous pupils who enjoyed an intimate intercourse with him, contributed greatly to the spread of

twenty-two Homilies upon Ezekiel; forty Homilies upon the Gospels; *Regula pastoralis, sive liber pastoralis curae* (a treatise upon pastoral theology for the clergymen of his day); *Dialogorum de vita et miraculis patrum ital. et de aeternitate animarum libri IV.*; *Epistolarum libri XIV.* (Ep. I. 25 contains the confession of faith which he sent to the other patriarchs, on his taking the episcopal office); *Liber sacramentorum* (containing the office of the mass); and *Liber antiphonarius* (containing the psalmody of the mass). Six books of Expositions upon 1 Kings, attributed to Gregory, are spurious. — The principal editions are the following: *Opera Gregorii* Ed. Goussainville, Par. 1685; Benedictine Ed. in three volumes, Par. 1705; *Opera Gregorii* Ed. Galliccioli, Ven. 1768–76, 17 vols. folio.

¹ Mostly by dogmatic selections from the writings of the Fathers, particularly Augustine and Gregory the Great, under the title of *Libri sententiarum*.

² Murray De Britannia atque Hibernia saeculis a sexto inde ad decimum literarum domicilio (in the *Novi Commentarii Soc. Gotting. I.* 72).

³ See Bede's account of him, in *Hist. eccl. lib. IV. V.*

⁴ Unwearied in his labors to the last, he died surrounded by his pupils, with the words of the doxology, Gloria Patri, Filio et Spiritui Sancto, upon his lips. His biography was written by his pupil Cuthbert. — *Vita Bedae Vener.* Compare Gehler, *De Bedae Vener. vita et scriptis.* Lugd. 1838.

⁵ Besides grammatical, mathematical, physical, and various other treatises, together with Letters, we have from Bede commentaries upon almost the whole

theological culture. And Bede was followed by *Alcuin* († 804), a man of devout piety and scientific insight, at first a pupil and afterwards the head of a cloister-school at York, but who spent the latter part of his life chiefly in the Frankish kingdom, whither he had been urgently invited by Charlemagne to take charge of literary and educational interests.¹

In the *Spanish* church the learned *Isidore* († 636), bishop of Seville, labored for the promotion of theological science; and the results of his endeavors were apparent as late as the Saracen rule in Spain in the eighth century.² In *Italy*, the remains of the theological learning of the earlier period still existed.

All these scattered elements of culture, *Charlemagne* — a man who could speak the Latin language and read the Greek, but whose hand, accustomed to the strong grasp of the sword, with difficulty formed letters with the pen — sought to combine into a great comprehensive system for the advantage of the Frankish church.³ Among the learned

Bible, a translation of the Gospel of John into Anglo-Saxon, made in the fourteen days preceding his death, sermons, and historical writings. To the latter, belong his *History of the World*, and his very interesting *Ecclesiastical History*: *Historiae ecclesiasticae gentis Anglorum* libb. V. Smith Cantabr. 1722; of which a translation has been published by Bohn, London, 1849. *Opera Bedae* Bas. 1563; Cologne, 1681.

¹ Alcuin accepted the invitation to the court of Charlemagne in 782; in 790 he returned to England and spent two years there; returning in 792, he became abbot of Tours in 796, which office he resigned in 801, and spent the remaining three years of his life in private study and meditation. Besides grammatical, rhetorical, and philosophical writings, Alcuin has left some dogmatic writings respecting the Trinity (*De fide sanctae et individuae trinitatis*), and against the Adoption theory, together with others of an exegetical and biographical nature; and also two hundred and thirty-two Letters. *Opera* ed. Quercetanus, Par. 1617; Frobenius Ratisb. 1777. For his biography see *Opera*; *Acta Sanctorum*; and *Lorenz Alkuins Leben*. Halle, 1829.

² The most important of the many writings of Isidore, are: A liturgical work, *De ecclesiasticis officiis* libb. II.; an extensive etymological and encyclopaedical work, *Originum sive Etymologiarum codex* libb. XX.; a manual in dogmatics and ethics, libb. III. *sententiarum* (chiefly a selection from the Fathers, particularly Augustine and Gregory the Great); a continuation of the Catalogue of ecclesiastical writers by Jerome and Gennadius; and a *Historia Gothorum, Vandalorum, Suevorum*. *Opera*, Rome, 1797.

³ *Launoji De scholis a Carolo Magno instauratis*, Par. 1672; *Van Her-*

theologians whom he drew to his court for this purpose, from Ireland, England, Spain, and Italy, the most distinguished was *Alcuin*, his principal adviser and minister of public instruction. Under the superintendence of Alcuin, the Vulgate version of the Scriptures was corrected and revised for popular use, a school for the higher ranks was established at the court (*schola Palatina*), and cathedral or cloister schools were founded throughout the kingdom in which the seven liberal sciences — the trivium (grammar, logic, rhetoric), and quadrivium (music, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy) — were taught. Of three schools, the most celebrated were those of Troyes, Ferrieres, and particularly Tours. Alcuin retired from public life in 801, and his plans were carried out by his pupils, *Eginhard* († 844) and *Paul Warnefrid* (see § 102).

§ 105.

THEOLOGY IN THE EAST.

More learning had come down from the preceding periods, and been preserved, in the Greek church, than in the Western; but the animating life, and free developement of truth, had been interrupted by political and ecclesiastical despotism during the long and tedious controversy, and only a dry pedantry remained.

In *Exegesis*, little more was done than to collect and arrange the expositions of the preceding Greek Fathers, — the basis of the subsequent *Catenae*,¹ well called so, as they were chains in which a fettered exegesis of Scripture walked about.

In *Dogmatic Theology*, the Monophysite controversy, even more subtle in this period than in the preceding, had

werden Comm. de iis quae a Car. Mag. ad propag. etc. L. B. 1825; Lorentz De Car. Mag. literar. fautore, Hal. 1828.

¹ Compare Noessel De catenis patrum Graecorum in N. T. Hal. 1762.

elicited a *dialectic tendency* which was strengthened by the study of the Aristotelian philosophy. Its representative was the distinguished monk *John Damascene* († 760), a presbyter at Jerusalem, who, according to one account, had been a treasurer at the court of the Caliph Al Mansur. His work, entitled, "Ἐκδοσις ἀκριβῆς τῆς ὁρθοδόξου πίστεως, became, and still is, the principal dogmatic manual for the Greek church, and with it the great body of Greek doctrinal literature concludes.¹ Parallel with this dialectic tendency, a *contemplative-mystical* tendency sprang up out of a mixture of Platonic with Christian ideas, which imperilled the simplicity of the gospel by its transcendental intuitions and bombastic modes of expression, and led the mind away from biblical, practical Christianity, to an empty idealism, that kept up its connection with the popular faith and superstition by its symbolical mode of interpretation. This tendency was increased by the spurious writings of *Dionysius the Areopagite* (Ancient Church, § 57), forged probably about the end of the fifth century.² They are first mentioned by the Monophysite Severians (§ 90), in a doctrinal debate at Constantinople in 533, where their authenticity was disputed by the catholic opponents of Monophysitism,³ but was soon after, about 600, defended by a presbyter *Theodorus*, and from this time they steadily rose in

¹ It properly constitutes only a part of his principal work Πηγή γνώσεως, of which the first parts treat of Dialectics, and the third of Heresies. There is also extant an important apologetic dialogue by Damascene, between a Christian and a Saracen. Compare *Lenstroem* De expositione fidei auctore Joh. Damasceno, Upsal. 1839. Opera ed. *Le Quien* Par. 1712, and Venet. 1748.

² They are the first attempts to *systematize* mysticism, and bring it into connection with the traditional theology. The best edition is that of Paris, 1744; they have been translated into German by *Engelhardt*, Sulzbach, 1823. Compare *Engelhardt* De Dionysio Areop. Plotinizante Erlangen, 1820, and also *De origine scriptorum Areop.* 1822; *Dallæus* De scriptis quæ sub Dion. Ar. et Ignatii nominibus circumferuntur, Genev. 1666; *Baumgarten-Crusius* De Dion. Ar. Jena. 1823; *Meier* Dionysii Areop. et mysticorum sæculi XIV doctrinae inter se comparantur, Hal. 1845; *Baur* Dreieingkeitslehre II. 207-263.

³ Upon the grounds of the *total* silence of the ancient church in reference to them, and the mention in them of usages that did not arise until three hundred years after the Apostolic age.

authority and influence. A third tendency, the *dialectic-mystical*, combining the two tendencies above mentioned, was represented by the acute and cultivated *Maximus the Confessor*, first a Byzantine imperial secretary, afterward a monk and abbot, who in 662 suffered martyrdom, in his eighty-second year, after horrible tortures and mutilations, for his steadfast adherence to the dyothelite doctrine. The opinions of Maximus had been formed by the study of the writings of Gregory of Nyssa and the Pseudo Dionysius; nevertheless they are characterized by an invincible adherence to logical orthodoxy, in opposition to the modifications commanded by the emperor for purposes of ecclesiastical union (see § 106), as well as by zeal for a living practical Christianity, in opposition to a dead faith and a mechanical virtue. A kind of commentary (*scholia*) upon the Dionysian treatises, which he composed, contributed much towards their spread and influence.¹ — These three tendencies of the Greek theology were sufficient, indeed, to preserve it from a stiff uniformity, but they could not breathe into it the warm breath of life.

Controversies relating to the Person of Christ.

§ 106.

to take see

MONOTHELITE CONTROVERSY.

Synodal Acts and documents in Mansi Tom. X. XI. Anastatii Bibliothecari Collectanea de iis quae spectant ad historiam Monotheliticam. Nicephori Breviarium historiae. Combefisii Historia haeresis Monothelitarum. Baur Dreieinigkeitslehre II. 96–128. Dörner Person Christi II. 193–305. Neander Church History III. 175–197. Walch Ketzerhistorie IX. 3.

The Monophysitism slumbering within the catholic church was once more preparing the materials for a new strife, in which the now mainly formal difference between the Cath-

¹ Neander Church History III. 171 sq.

olic and Monophysite doctrine was to be refined in the most subtle manner conceivable, and in which the dogmatic interest was to be combined with imperial despotism, with all of Justinian's zeal (§ 90), but not with Justinian's orthodoxy.

The attempt had been made in vain, during the preceding period, to unite the Catholic and Monophysite parties by doctrinal modifications of various kinds. The emperor *Heraclius*, engaged in war with the Persians (§ 95), had a strong motive to bring about this union between Christian parties, and the failure of previous endeavors neither warned nor instructed him. The representation of some Monophysite bishops whom he met about the year 622 in one of his campaigns against the Persians, that the two divisions could certainly be united, if, entirely avoiding the question whether there are one or two natures in Christ, it should be affirmed that there is only one will or mode of working in him, — an expression, they thought, which both parties could agree to, inasmuch as the church had been entirely silent respecting the relation of Christ's human will to his divine, — found a ready entrance into his mind; and the patriarch *Cyrus* of Alexandria, who had probably obtained his office because of his willingness to effect the union, was the first to enter into the emperor's plan. In 633, *Cyrus* announced the dogmatic formula, that Christ, as God and man in one person, had preformed all his divine and human actions by one theanthropic mode of working (*μία θεανθρική ἐνέργεια*), or one theanthropic will. But an acute dialectician then residing at Alexandria, the Palestine monk *Sophronius*, saw through the Monophysite device. Perceiving and asserting that the hypothesis of only one will was of necessity a denial of two natures, that two distinct and proper natures could not be conceived of in the person of Christ, unless there were two wills or modes of efficiency corresponding to them, viz., a divine and a human, and that Dyophysitism logically implied Dyothelitism, he openly rejected the formula of *Cyrus* as necessarily conducting to Monophysitism. *Cyrus* now betook himself, for advice, to

Sergius bishop of Constantinople. *Sergius* advised him to let the whole matter rest, since he had not attained his end by his formula; saying that any statement was exposed to misapprehension,—the doctrine of one will would be regarded as involving Monophysitism, the doctrine of two wills as implying an antagonism in Christ between the divine and human wills. Meanwhile, *Sophronius* had become patriarch of Constantinople in 634, and a yet more violent outbreak of the controversy was to be expected. *Sergius*, under these circumstances, thought it important to have an understanding with *Honorius* bishop of Rome (625–638). *Honorius* in his *Epistola ad Sergium*¹ sided with him in doctrinal respects, as well as in regard to his advice to *Cyrus*. The whole dispute, it seemed to him, was an idle speculation; at the same time, the doctrine of two wills, he thought, was an erroneous one, because of the antagonism in Christ's person that would result. What had been anticipated, now took place. *Sophronius*, upon taking the patriarchate, issued the usual inaugural letter, in which he combated Monothelitism in the most decided terms, and unfolded the opposite doctrine in a clear and acute manner. The hypothesis of two wills in Christ, he said, by no means implied an antagonism between the divine and the human in him; by means of the union of the two natures, neither one could work without the other participating in the efficiency; one and the same Christ, therefore, performs the divine and the human action, although each is wrought in accordance with the distinguishing quality of the nature that corresponds with it.² Soon after this, Palestine was violently severed from its connection with Christendom, by the Mohammedan conquest of the Caliph Omar; nevertheless, the impression of the letter of *Sophronius* was not thereby obliterated. On the contrary, the strife increased only the more, and *Heraclius* in 638 attempted to suppress it by a dogmatic edict, *Ἐκδήσις τῆς πίστεως*.³ In this, he

¹ In *Mansi* Tom. XI. p. 537.

² *Sophronii Synodica* in *Mansi Coll. Concill.* Tom. XI. 461.

³ *Mansi* Tom. p. 992.

reaffirms the doctrine of two natures, but forbade the assertion of either one *will*, or two *wills*, — the latter with special emphasis. But such an imperial edict of union could not harmonize the contending parties. It was regarded as designed to favor Monothelitism; and from this time onward the Roman see rallied its force, and energetically opposed the theory of one will. The two immediate successors of Honorius, *Severinus* (638–644) and *John IV.* (640–642), declared for the doctrine of two wills; and their successor *Theodorus* (642–649) went so far as to pronounce the ban of excommunication, in 646, against the Monothelite *Paulus* patriarch of Constantinople. In the East, moreover, there was by no means a general assent to the imperial decision. On the contrary, the monk *Maximus* (§105) stood forth, with great success, as the acute and immoveable defender of Dyothelitism.¹ The dispute ran so high, that the emperor *Constans II.* (642–668) issued a new dogmatic edict (*Τύπος τῆς πίστεως*)² in 648, in which he commanded all parties, under threat of severe penalties, to abide by the ancient doctrine of the church, and that neither party should hereticate the other. But the opponents of Monothelitism saw in this edict, also, either a concealed Monosphytism and Monothelitism, or else a censurable indifference to all truth; and they found a strong champion in the Roman bishop *Martin I.* who, like Maximus, resisted the emperor by both an acute speculation and an energetic

¹ Arguing against the Arabian bishop *Theodore* of Pharan, the principal defender of Monothelitism, Maximus maintained that the ground of antagonism between the Divine and the human could not be in the nature of the human will, — for this would make God the author of sin, — but in sin. Consequently, in the sinless Christ there could be both a divine and a human will, without any antagonism between them. Furthermore, it was necessary to assume two wills in Christ: *first*, because it was the human will that originated sin, and therefore the human will must be assumed into union with the divine, in order to redemption; and *secondly*, because a true and proper human nature is not conceivable without a true and proper human will. There would be no real and *complete* humanizing of the Logos, unless there were a *complete* humanity. Moreover, those who denied the existence of a human will in Christ, could not explain such merely human actions as eating, drinking, etc., except upon the theory of Docetism.

² Mansi Tom. X. 1029.

practicality. Olympius, the exarch of Ravenna, the emperor's Italian viceoy, received orders to arrest the bishop. But the viceroy himself was plotting an insurrection against the emperor, in which the favor of the Dyothelites would be a matter of importance to him, while at the same time, he did not feel himself sufficiently strong to enforce the imperial orders, even if he had been so inclined. Instead, therefore, of promulgating the emperor's edict in Italy, and humbling the Roman bishop, Olympius quietly allowed Martin to summon a council, in 649, in the Lateran church at Rome,—the *first Lateran synod*,—which adopted the Dyothelite doctrine, that Christ had willed the salvation of men in the same natural way in both natures, and uttered an anathema against Monothelitism, its defender the patriarch of Constantinople, and the two edicts which the emperor had issued concerning it. The emperor regarded this as high treason. A new Italian viceroy, Calliopas,¹ in 653, took the Roman bishop prisoner, in the Lateran church, where he lay sick upon his couch. Not being able to call upon his people for aid, Martin submitted with calmness and dignity to the most unworthy treatment when arrested, and afterwards during a highly fatiguing and purposely prolonged voyage to Constantinople. On arriving at Constantinople, he patiently endured every shameful accusation and maltreatment, and in 654 was exiled to Chersonesus, where he died in outward wretchedness but with inward courage and faith, on September 16th, 655.² A yet severer lot befel the aged *Maximus*, who in 662 perished a horribly mutilated sacrifice (§ 105) to the court theology bent upon union and pacification!

*First Lateran
Synod 649*

Such despotic power stifled for a time every voice raised against Monothelitism; but only for a short time. In the Western church, which, after some wavering, had withdrawn fellowship, in 677, under the lead of the energetic Roman bishop Adeodatus, with the now mostly Monoth-

¹ Olympius had been killed in a battle with the Saracens in Sicily.

² See the *Commemoratio eorum, quae saeviter acta sunt in Martinum*, in Mansi Tom. X. 851.

elite East, and particularly with the patriarch of Constantinople, the Dyothelite doctrine spread without interruption, until finally it acquired the victory also in the Greek church. In order to heal the disquieting schism between the West and East, the emperor *Constantius Pogonatus* (668–685), convened the *sixth oecumenical council* at Constantinople,—called the *First Trullan*, from the *Τρουλλός*, or dome, arching the room in the imperial palace where the council assembled,—at which the Roman bishop *Agatho* (678–682) exerted great influence by a dogmatic letter which he sent by his delegates. After a patient and orderly investigation of the whole subject, the council decided in favor of the Dyothelite doctrine. Of the two most vehement opponents of Dyothelitism, *Gregorius* patriarch of Constantinople, whether convinced by his examination of the writings of the Fathers, or from external motives, renounced Monothelitism, and *Macarius*, patriarch of Antioch, was deposed. All Monothelites, including even Honorius of Rome, were anathematized, and the symbol of the council enunciated, that there are in Christ two natural wills or modes of efficiency (corresponding to the two natures), existing without schism or divergence, as well as without change or mixture, while yet there is no antagonism between them, but the human will is constantly subject to the divine and almighty will.¹ This symbol was reaffirmed by the *Second Trullan council*, convened in 692 by *Justinian II.*, as a supplementary council to the fifth and sixth oecumenical councils (hence denominated *Consilium Quinsextum*) which had been occupied solely with doctrinal points.²

¹ The original (in Mansi XI. 631 sq.) announces that δύο φυσικὰς δελήσεις ἦτοι δελήματα ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ δύο φυσικὰς ἐνεργείας ἀδιαρέτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀμερίστως, ἀσυγχύτως κηρύττομεν· καὶ δύο μὲν φυσικὰ δελήματα οὐχ ὑπεναντία, ἀλλ' ἐπομενον τῷ ἀνθρώπινον αὐτοῦ δέλημα καὶ ὑποτασσόμενον τῷ θεῷ αὐτοῦ καὶ πανσθενεῖ δελήματι. Τό ἀνθρώπινον αὐτοῦ δέλημα θεόθεν οὐκ ἀνιρέθη. Δοξάζομεν θεῖαν ἐνεργειαν καὶ ἀνθρωπίνην ἐνέργειαν. Ἐνεργεῖ γὰρ ἑκατέρα μορφή μετὰ τῆς θατέρου κοινωνίας ὑπὲρ ἰδίου ἔσχκε, τοῦ μὲν λόγου κατεργαζομένου τοῦτο ὅπερ ἐστὶ τοῦ λόγου, τοῦ δὲ σώματος ἐκτελούντος ὅπερ ἐστὶ τοῦ σώματος.

² This council revised the existing canonical regulations, and drew up a body

A spasmodic and transitory attempt to restore the Monothelite doctrine was made by the emperor *Philippicus Bardanes* (711–713), who had succeeded in dethroning Justinian II. But when Philippicus was himself dethroned by *Anastasius II.* this attempt, which Rome from the first had vigorously opposed, lost its chief external support, and the characterless patriarch *John* of Constantinople, the creature of Philippicus, was ready to accept anything. The Dyothelite doctrine was then defended in the Greek church, by the acute and influential *John of Damascus*.

A small body of Monothelites maintained a permanent existence in Syria, — the sole relic of a once great and powerful party. The inhabitants of Lebanon settled in the sixth century around the cloister of a *St. Maro*, by whom they were probably taught the Monothelite doctrine. The tribe took the name of *Maronites*,¹ and the abbots of the convent managed their civil and military affairs. They chose for themselves a patriarch of Antioch (the first was *John Maro* † 701), and, secure in their mountain fastnesses, maintained their independence against the Greeks and the Mohammedan Arabians, confessing the doctrine of one will in Christ down to the time of the Crusades. In the twelfth century negotiations were entered upon, with success, for the union of the Maronites with the Roman church; but they did not essentially modify the Monothelite doctrine.

of ecclesiastical statutes for the Greek church, which contributed to widen the distance between it and the Western, and prepared the way for the final separation. It settled the question respecting the number of the Apostolical canons (§ 57, 3), the marriage of priests, the rank of the patriarch of Constantinople, fast on Saturday, partaking of blood and things strangled, etc. The council was regarded as oecumenical in the East, but not recognized in the West. See the *Acta and Canones* in *Mansi Tom. XI.* 921–1006.

¹ *Le Quien Oriens Christianus Tom. III. p. 1 sq.*

§ 107.

ADOPTIAN CONTROVERSY.

Walch *Historia Adoptianorum*, and *Ketzerhistorie* IX. 667 sq. Frobenius *Dissertatio de haeresi Elipandi et Felicis* in *Opera Alcuini* Tom. I. 923 sq. Baur *Dreieinigkeitslehre* II. 129–159. Dorner *Person Christi* II. 306–330. Neander *Church History* III. 156–168. Milman *Latin Christianity*, Book IV. chap. vi.

The Roman church had been the chief instrument in bringing the Monothelite controversy to a conclusion. Yet the whole West did not stand upon the same dogmatic position with Rome. In Spain, under new forms and names, the old and rejected Nestorianism with its rationalizing tendency appeared once more, in opposition to the supernaturalism of the church.

Towards the end of the eighth century, *Elipandus*, the archbishop of Toledo in Spain, an impulsive and zealous octogenarian, and *Felix* bishop of Urgellis in Catalonia, a man much superior to Elipandus in learning and acuteness, brought forward a theory respecting the mutual relation of the two natures in Christ, which strictly separated the divine from the human predicates in his Person, and which was the development of the Christology first broached by the Antiochian school, and afterwards expanded by Nestorius and his adherents. They had perhaps been led to this dogmatic position by the study of the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, which had become known to the West through the Controversy of the Three Chapters (*Ancient Church*, § 90); or perhaps from an endeavor to defend and make intelligible, the deity of Christ, in opposition to the crude objections of the Anti-Trinitarian Mohammedans. In constructing their theory, they make special use of a clause in the Gothic-Spanish liturgy,¹ in which the assumption of humanity by the Son of God was denominated “*adoptio*,” —

¹ The *Officium Mostarabicum* was the liturgy of the Spanish Christians in an Arabian district — a mixed Arabic document.

the term very often employed as synonymous with "assumptio." Founding upon this, they maintained that Christ, as to his divine nature, is properly and strictly the Son of God (*filius Dei genere, natura*); but as to his human nature, is adoptively the Son of God (*filius Dei adoptione, filius Dei gratia, beneficio, voluntate, assumptione, electione*). Hence the party were called *Adoptians*. As many of the Adoptian speculations either logically involved a denial of the true deity and theanthropy of Christ, or else paved the way for it,¹ and as the whole system bore so decidedly the character of Nestorianism, Felix, whose episcopal see was still under Frankish rule, and his doctrine spreading in the Frankish kingdom, soon met with earnest opponents. *Beatus*,² a Spanish priest, and *Etherius* bishop of Othma first stood forth in opposition to Adoptianism. Elipandus took the ground that his opponents were heretics and servants of Anti-Christ, and must be extirpated. His opponents, on the other hand, maintained that they were contending for the very foundations of faith in the one Christ, the God-man. Soon the controversy broke out into a flame, both in Spain and France. An ecclesiastical and civil assembly at *Regensburg*, in 792, convened under the authority of *Charlemagne*, at which Felix was present, investigated the subject, Charlemagne being influenced not only by the desire to settle the dispute in the church, but also by the wish to gain the orthodox bishops of Spain to his interest, because he was meditating the design of wresting Spain from the rule of the Saracens. The convention condemned Adoptianism; and Felix recanted, and sent a copy of his recantation to the pope at Rome. Nevertheless, on his return to his bishopric he persisted in holding his former

¹ As when, e. g. Felix said that the Son of God, as to his humanity, was raised to communion with God by divine grace, *like his disciples*, although "multo excellentius," and that hence he was *Deus nuncupatione*; when he compared the baptism of Christ in Jordan with the regeneration of believers; when, in reference to Christ, he inquired: "Quid potuit ex ancilla nasci nisi servus?" Such positions seemed to imply that the connection of Christ's humanity with deity, differed from that of ordinary men only in degree, and not in kind.

² A fragment of his is extant in *Canisii Lectiones antiquæ*. Tom. II. 310.

doctrine, and betook himself to a region under Saracen rule. *Alcuin*, at Charlemagne's request, sent Felix an affectionate letter, — warning him against an obstinate and disputatious spirit, and another letter to the clergy and monks of the Spanish provinces bordering on France, refuting Adoptianism (*Alcunii libellus adversus haeresin Felicis*). But without effect. The Saracen-Spanish bishops now asked Charlemagne for another investigation of their views; but the council of *Frankfort-on-the-Maine*, convened at their request, in 794, decided against Adoptianism. Meanwhile Felix had defended his doctrine against Alcuin in a special treatise, and hence Alcuin, at the request of Charlemagne, in conjunction with three distinguished Frankish bishops, — *Paulinus* of Aquileia († 804), *Theodulph* of Orleans, and *Richbon* of Treves, — composed new works against Adoptianism, of which, after that of Alcuin (*Adversus Felicin libb. VII.*), the treatise of Paulinus is the most important. The emperor, in order to prevent the spread of Adoptianism, also sent some theologians, namely *Leidrad* archbishop of Lyons, *Benedict* an abbot of Aniana, and *Nefrid* bishop of Narbonne, to the Spanish border. *Leidrad* now persuaded Felix to appear before an ecclesiastical tribunal that should candidly examine the whole subject. He came before the *synod of Aix*, in 799, and after a discussion of several days with Alcuin declared himself to be convinced, and renounced his Adoptianism in a written document (*Confessio fidei Felicis*). He then spent the remainder of his days at Lyons, under the oversight of the archbishop. In the year 800, the same three deputies were sent again to the Spanish border, and, influenced by a letter of Alcuin (*Ep. 92*), some ten thousand persons renounced Adoptianism. *Elipandus*, on the other hand, secure behind his Moorish protection, steadily and vehemently repelled all the endeavors which Alcuin made by letters to convert him. Nevertheless, in the ninth century Adoptianism fell into entire oblivion. Felix died in 816, and a paper of his, found after his death, written over with Adoptianizing theses and questions, elicited a reply by *Agobard*, archbishop of Lyons (*Adversus dogma Felicis lib.*).

Image Controversies.

The Byzantine historians, viz.: Nicephorus Breviarium Historiae, and Theophanes Chronographia. Imperialia decreta de cultu imaginum a Haiminsfeldio Goldasto. Dallaeus De imaginibus. Spanheim Historia imaginum restitut. Maimbourg Histoire de l' hérésie des Iconoclastes. Marx Der Bilderstreit der byzantin. Kaiser. Schlosser Geschichte der bilderstürmenden Kaiser. Flathe Geschichte der Vorläufer der Reformation. Gibbon Decline and Fall, chap. XLIX. Neander Church History III. 197–243. Milman Latin Christianity, Book IV. chap. vii. viii.

§ 108.

OBJECT AND CHARACTER OF THE CONTROVERSY.

A controversy of an entirely new and different kind arose in this period respecting *Image Worship*, in which we discover three different tendencies and theories. One party would make an idolatrous use of images and pictures; another party would forbid all use of them under pains and penalties; a third party, supported by the authority of Gregory the Great and under the auspices of Charlemagne, sought a middle ground, and would employ them only as an aid to devotion.

In the image, said the *first* party, we know the divine object, or the sacred thing, represented by it. Said the *second* party: all use of images in religion is contrary to the spiritual nature of Christianity, and to represent divine things under sensible images, is to dishonor and degrade them. A *third* party, which engaged in the controversy only from a distance and indirectly, distinguished between an allowable and even praiseworthy use of religious images and a misuse of them, maintaining that art, like every other province of human activity, may be sanctified and made subservient to Christianity. The *second* theory, though founded also in the nature of Christianity, had naturally sprung up originally in opposition to heathenism, and was the most generally adopted in the ancient church,—supporting itself particularly by the letter of the Old Testa-

ment. The *third* theory had formed itself by degrees out of the second, with some show of reason interpreting the Old Testament teachings as allowing a use of sensible representations, from the fact that God himself, in his revealed word, had communicated so much truth under symbols of various sorts, nay, in the Old Economy had even set forth man as an image of himself (Gen. i. 26), and especially, in the New Economy, had manifested himself in the person of Christ. This was the view taken by *Gregory the Great* when, at the request of a certain eremite, he sent him an image of Christ, with the explanation (Epistoll. IX. 52) that it is a need of human nature to possess some visible representation of an absent or invisible friend, and also with the warning that he must regard the image simply as an instrument of conducting him to the Saviour himself. The same view of the subject also led Gregory to express his approbation of the pious zeal with which *Serenus*, bishop of Marseilles, had opposed the superstitious regard for images that was springing up in his diocese, and at the same time to censure him for indiscriminately destroying all images, instead of instructing the rude Franks respecting the right use of them. This, he said, did not consist in the worship of the images themselves, but in regarding them as a means of awakening devotion and imparting knowledge, especially among rude and uncultivated men.

The *first* view, that, namely, of the image-worshippers, owing to the fervid fancy and enthusiastic love of art characteristic of the Greeks, had gained currency earliest in the Greek church; so that by the beginning of the seventh century the Greek apologists were compelled to defend Christianity from the charge of idolatry, made by the Jews and Mohammedans upon this ground; and from this date onward, this view of images became more and more general as the tendency of the whole church to superstition became more and more total. To God alone is adoration due, they said; but in the image one does not worship the mere image itself, but the Christ represented

therein; even as in the saint, not the man, but the grace of God, is venerated. And since they could not appeal to Scripture in support of their theory, they appealed all the more to the authority of a particular tradition decked out with legendary tales relating to the wonderful virtues of images. One principal argument which the image-worshippers relied upon in their controversy was, that he who did not acknowledge Christ in the image, could not acknowledge the reality of his incarnation. The final victory of the opponents of image-worship was less beneficial to the church than it would otherwise have been, from the fact that, instead of proceeding moderately, and in the way of instruction and persuasion, they employed the strong arm of the civil power to put down the superstition of fanatical monks, and uneducated people, by sheer force.

§ 109.

The controversy commenced first in the *Greek Church*, in which the worship of images first obtained a general currency.

The emperor *Leo III., the Isaurian* (717–741), had discovered that the Jews and Mohammedans, whom he desired to Christianize, were scandalized by the idolatrous veneration of images by the Christians. His attention having been directed by some ecclesiastics to the fact that the veneration of images was forbidden by God in the Old Testament, he first sought, but in vain, the concurrence of the ecclesiastical conclave at Constantinople, and then in 726, with the advice of his privy council, issued an edict against the custom of prostration and kneeling before images, though not against all use of images in devotion, — under this concealing his ulterior designs. Upon this, several zealous defenders of image-worship appeared, particularly *Germanus*¹ the patriarch of Constantinople, and

¹ Germanus maintained that no image should be made of the invisible God;

John Damascene,¹ and the inhabitants of the Cycladic islands rose in insurrection. The success of his attempt to destroy the fleet of the rebels, by the Greek fire, the emperor regarded as a token that God favored his designs; and in 730 he issued a second edict forbidding, under penalty, any use of any images of saints, martyrs, angels, or Christ. Germanus now resigned his office, and his secretary, the pliant courtier *Anastasius*, was appointed patriarch in his place; and notwithstanding the violent popular commotion that attended the removal of celebrated images, the emperor continued to enforce his edict until his death.

His son and successor *Constantinus Copronymus* (741—775) pursued the same course, with yet greater consistency and energy. After his victory in 744 over his brother-in-law *Artabasdos*, who with the assistance of the advocates of image worship among the masses had risen in rebellion, the emperor worked upon a carefully formed iconoclastic plan to destroy images utterly and forever. In 754 he convened the *council of Constantinople*, composed of three hundred bishops, which he ordered should be called the seventh oecumenical, though not a single one of the patriarchs was present.² This council³ pronounced the anath-

and that this was the meaning of the Old Testament prohibition. But God had since appeared in a human form; and of *this* form it was proper to make a representation. To deny this, was virtually to deny that the God-man had a real personal appearance, and involved Docetism.

¹ John Damascene composed three treatises in defence of images. "The Lord," he said, "had pronounced his disciples blessed for what their eyes had seen. They had seen him with the bodily eye; we see him through the image. As beings of a complex sensuous and spiritual nature, we attain to a spiritual intuition only through a sensuous one. For this reason, Christ assumed both soul and body. Everything in worship, baptism, the sacraments, etc., is a combination of the sensible and the spiritual. As for the emperor's edict, it did not belong to earthly princes to prescribe laws for the church of God. Not emperors, but apostles, pastors, and teachers are mentioned in Scripture as those who are to have the guidance of the church."

² The see of Constantinople was vacant; Rome had excommunicated the Iconoclasts, and refused to send to the council; Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem were now under Saracen domination.

³ Fragments of the *Acta* are given in Mansi Tom. XIII. p. 205 sq.

ema upon all image-makers, as being chargeable with either the Nestorian or the Eutychian heresy,¹ designated the sacrament of the supper as the only true representation of Christ, and condemned all use of religious images in the most unmeasured terms. In order to counteract a dangerous rumor respecting their orthodoxy, the council uttered an anathema against those who opposed the veneration of Mary and the saints, — a measure not at all in accordance with the spirit and other acts of the body. The emperor executed the decrees of the council in the most unsparing manner,² and as the monks, who were some of them painters, made an earnest resistance, he gave them over to the most shameful punishment and indignities.³ By such means and methods, the party of *Iconoclasts* (εἰκονομαχοὶ as opposed to εἰκονολάτραι) now became dominant.

Constantine was succeeded by his son *Leo IV. Chazarus* (775–780), of the same views with his father, but not of equal ability, whose cunning consort *Irene*, as superstitious as she was immoral, was a zealous image-worshipper. After the early death of the emperor, and during the minority of his son *Constantine* (780–802), she had ample opportunity for carrying out her wishes. Favorite monks were appointed to the most important ecclesiastical offices, the weak-minded *Paul*, patriarch of Constantinople, penitent for having permitted the destruction of the images,

¹ The argument for this charge was as follows : It is confessedly impossible to make a sensible image of the divine nature of Christ ; the image-worshipper must either assume, then, that the humanity of Christ separate from his divinity can be represented, and this is Nestorianism, or that from the mixture of the deity and humanity a third substance arises that is representable, and this is Eutychianism.

² All representations of sacred objects upon the walls of the churches were washed over with paint ; in the place of paintings representing the life of Christ from his birth to his ascension, pictures of animals, fruit-trees, hunting-scenes, etc., were substituted ; and even pictures upon the books used in the churches were ordered to be obliterated. In the city of Phocaea more than three hundred books were burned in obedience to this order.

³ Such as scourging, cutting off the nose, ears, hands, boring out the eyes, etc. Monks, led about arm in arm with females, were compelled to submit to the jeers of the populace.

resigned his office, and the zealous image-worshipper, a courtier *Tarasius*, was appointed in his place. The new patriarch resumed connection with the Roman church, which through the whole controversy had declared in favor of the image-worshippers; and as the last council could not be regarded as oecumenical, the patriarch not having been present, a new general council was convened in 786 at *Constantinople*. But the imperial body-guard, still adhering to the views of their favorite emperor Constantine Copronymus, at the opening of the council excited violent commotions, and hence Irene dismissed the council for the present, — and this the more willingly, inasmuch as many of the bishops did not agree with her. By means of various machinations of courtiers and court-bishops, Irene first made herself more sure of a successful result, and then convened the council again at *Nice*, the place where the first oecumenical council was held. This *seventh oecumenical council*, at Nice, in 787,¹ composed of about three hundred and fifty bishops, unanimously declared that the acts of the iconoclastic council of Constantinople, in 754, were null and void, and formally authorized the worship of images, — yet not as divine adoration (λατρεία), but only as a reverential homage (προσκύνησις τιμητική), a distinction upon which a refined polytheism could have been justified, and which the mass of the people did not make.²

³ The conclusions of the seventh oecumenical council did not, however, permanently settle the controversy in the Byzantine empire. The iconoclastic party revived again, and acquired power once more. After two emperors who favored image-worship, the Iconoclasts at Constantinople, who had still maintained themselves there as a party, and who believed that the political misfortunes of these two

¹ The Acta are in Mansi Tom. XII. 951 — XIII. 820.

² The council made the distinction in the following language: "Ἡ γὰρ τῆς εἰκότος τιμὴ ἐπὶ τὸ πρωτότυπον διαβαίνει· καὶ ὁ προσκυνῶν τὴν εἰκόνα προσκυνεῖ ἐν αὐτῇ τοῦ ἐγγραφομένου τὴν ὑπόστασιν.

³ This part of the history of the Image controversy chronologically falls into the next period; but the historical connection is better preserved by giving this short remainder of the subject here. Compare Neander III. 530–551.

emperors were at once a judgment upon their opponents, and a proof of the correctness of their own cause, found upon the throne an emperor of their own way of thinking. *Leo V. the Armenian* (813–820), confirmed in his opinion by a selection, which he had asked from *John Grammaticus*, from the writings of the older church-fathers respecting image-worship, proposed, at first, to diminish the number of images, in accordance with the desire of many Iconoclasts in his native country, Armenia. But the remonstrances of the patriarch *Nicephorus* of Constantinople, and the still more vigorous opposition of the highly respected abbot *Theodorus Studita*¹ of Constantinople, and his monks, checked the emperor, until the representations of the Iconoclasts, that the words in Isaiah xl. 18: ‘To whom will ye liken God,’ read in public worship upon a certain occasion, were a voice from heaven calling upon him to destroy the worship of idols, induced him, in 814, to take more active measures. In 815 Nicephorus was deposed on account of his persistent opposition to the emperor, and a new patriarch, *Theodotus Cassiteras*, a descendant of Constantine Copronymus, was appointed, and a synod convened in the same year at *Constantinople* forbade image-worship. But the monks persisted in its defence. No means whatever could silence *Theodore Studita*, in particular. Theodore renounced church fellowship with the Iconoclasts, even broke off all intercourse with them, and neither scourging, nor chains, nor repeated exile, could overcome his fixed opposition to the emperor.

Leo at last fell a victim to a political conspiracy, and was succeeded by *Michael II. the Stammerer* (820–829), an enemy to *Leo*, and who had been cast into prison by him. *Michael* was also an enemy of image-worship, and hardly less so than *Leo*, and probably a rejector of some essentials of the Christian system (for example, the doctrine of a resurrection, and of the devil). Yet upon political grounds

¹ Born 759; died, after a four years’ exile, in 826. He was the head of the celebrated cloister of Studites at Constantinople, and has left letters, sermons, and dogmatical and ascetical writings.

he sought to reconcile the opposing parties, and allowed the private worship of images. But this did not satisfy the image-worshippers, who disseminated exaggerated reports concerning the emperor's heretical opinions, which attracted so much notice, particularly in the Romish church where image-worship was still protected, that the emperor thought it necessary to send a justification of himself to the Roman pope Paschalis I., and, in order to obtain a favorable reception for it, to send an embassy to Louis the Pious. The consequence of this was, that image-worship now assumed a most superstitious and absurd form,¹ so that the successor of Michael, *Theophilus* (829-842), felt constrained by his genuine religious feeling to pursue an unsparing course; and an imperial edict in 830 strictly forbade any use of images, either in public or private worship. But this triumph of the Iconoclasts was of short duration. The emperor died in 842, leaving the government in the hands of his queen *Theodora*, a zealous image-worshipper, and her son Michael a minor, whose two guardians *Theoctiscus* and *Manuel* were also image-worshippers. A new patriarch, *Methodius*, was appointed, a synod of Constantinople reaffirmed the decisions of the seventh oecumenical council, and upon Feb. 19, the first Sunday of Lent in 842, the images were carried in splendid procession and restored to the cathedral church in Constantinople. Ever since, the Greek church, at first in memory of the restoration of image-worship, and afterwards in memory also of all the patriarchs and emperors that had been zealous for orthodoxy, has observed the first Sunday of Lent as the *Feast of Orthodoxy* (ἡ κυριακὴ τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας, ἡ πανήγυρις τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας).

The *Western Church* was also involved in the Image controversy.

In the *Roman church*, after the time of Gregory the Great, a revolution took place in the mode of thinking and

¹ Hymns were chanted before images; they were taken as god-fathers in baptism; the paint upon them was mixed with the sacramental wine; the sacramental bread was placed in the hand of an image, to make it a communicant, etc.

feeling; and one token of this was a superstitious reverence for images. *Leo the Isaurian* engaged in a spirited correspondence upon the subject with Pope *Gregory II.* (715–731). This pope, and his successor *Gregory III.* (731–741), declared the Iconoclasts to be heretics; and the Greek emperors, though ready enough to do so, could not chastise them for this. The seventh oecumenical council found a supporter in pope *Hadrian I.* (772–795).

In the *Frankish* church, on the other hand, the views of *Gregory the Great* were generally prevalent. The subject of images was discussed at an assembly at *Gentilly* in 767, occasioned by an embassy from *Constantine Copronymus* to king *Pepin*, but nothing is known of the decision there made. The first reliable accounts proceed from the time of *Charlemagne*. This emperor, upon receiving the decrees of the seventh oecumenical council, caused a special work to be prepared for the refutation of them, which was sent forth in 790, in his name, and by his authority. This work — the so-called *Libri Carolini* — took the position that no kind of worship should be offered to images, but that the Greek Iconoclasts erred in excluding them altogether from the churches. On the contrary they should be permitted to remain, as the remembrancers of sacred objects, as the means of awakening religious feeling and imparting instruction particularly to rude minds, and lastly as appropriate ornaments of the sacred edifice.¹ The synod of *Frankfort-on-the-Maine* in 794, at which a papal legate presided, made a decision in conformity with these positions. *Charlemagne* sent the decision, and the *Libri Carolini*, to pope *Hadrian II.* for his approval; but the pope composed a refutation of the “*Caroline Books*” which, however, was too feeble to make an impression upon the *Frankish* church.

¹ The *Libri Carolini* were composed chiefly by *Alcuin*, and are characterized by pure Christian feeling, with strong opposition to superstition, and to the Byzantine adulation of the emperors. They also exhibit a noteworthy historical criticism in reference to the legend concerning the picture of Christ sent to king *Abgarus*. While, however, they oppose the worship of images, they strongly advocate the use of the sign of the cross, and of saint-relics. Edited by *Du Tillet*, 1549, and *Heumann*, Hanov. 1731.

The embassy of *Michael the Stammerer* to *Lewis the Pious* occasioned new discussions respecting image-worship. In order to mediate between the two contending parties in the Greek church, and, if possible, to draw off the Roman church from a superstitious worship of images, the emperor *Lewis* urged the pope *Eugenius II.* (824–827) to authorize another investigation of the subject, and with the pope's assent the matter was devolved upon a synod at *Paris* in 825. The synod drew up its decrees¹ entirely in accordance with the views of the Frankish church as enunciated in the time of *Charlemagne*, and appointed two bishops (*Jeremiah* archbishop of Sens, and *Jonas* bishop of Orleans) to lay them before the pope, with the particular charge not to irritate the "*pertinacia Romana*." Respecting the result of these discussions we know nothing, except that the Roman and Frankish churches continued to adhere each to its previous position. Through the whole of the ninth century, and after, the German church adhered to the same position with the Frankish; but the popes found it expedient to pass a milder judgment upon this deviation from Roman orthodoxy, in this instance, than in that of the Greek church.

§ 110.

DOGMATICO-HISTORICAL SURVEY.

As the system of Christian doctrine had been formed, as to its essentials, in the first three centuries, and had been put into an authorized creed-statement during the controversies that arose from the fourth to the sixth century, it only remained for the theologians of this period to investigate particular points. As a consequence, the dogmatic thinking of this period, and also of the next succeeding, — both of which constitute the period of transition to the

¹ In *Mansi Tom. XIV.* 415 sq.

later and full-formed Scholasticism, — exhibits a fragmentary character and aspect. Only three points of doctrine came up for consideration.

1. In the preceding period, the *Occidental doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit from Father and Son* had been distinctly enunciated at the council of Toledo, in 589. This was still the received doctrine at the West, but was becoming a standing subject of dispute between the Eastern and Western churches. There had been, indeed, some attempts to harmonize the dogmatic differences between the Latin and Greek churches by middle positions. Greek writers had spoken of a procession of the Spirit from the Father though the Son, and of the Spirit as sent by the Son, etc., and Augustine had represented the procession of the Spirit as *principaliter a patre*. John of Damascus, the principal theologian of the Greek church, though handling the subject of the procession of the Spirit in accordance with the Greek theory, did so in a moderate form and manner. The Father, he taught, is the *causa efficiens* in the triad, and the being of the Spirit, as well as of the Son, is grounded in him; although the Father has imparted all to the Son, and the Father has wrought all through the Son (*Ἐκδοσις*, Lib. I. c. 7, 8, 12). Under these circumstances, therefore, it was natural that the formal addition, by the Western church, of *filioque* to the venerated oecumenical symbol of Nice and Constantinople, should look like a suspicious innovation, and should occasion much offence and collision. Notwithstanding the Greek opposition, the Western doctrine was reaffirmed at the synod of *Gentilly* in 767, and especially at the council of *Friaul* (Forum Juleii) in 796. At this latter council, *Paulinus* of Aquileia maintained, in opposition to the Greek objection that no addition should be made to an ancient and oecumenical symbol, that the examination and completion of an original document, in accordance with the needs of a particular age and with reference to new errors that are rising, was allowable, and that the supplementing of the creed in the present instance was as justifiable as the additions that were made to the Nicene

symbol by the council of Constantinople. Finally, Charlemagne caused the ancient creed, with the addition of the Occidental clause, to be solemnly adopted at the council of *Aix la Chapelle* in 809, and sent the decision to pope *Leo III*. The pope declared the added clause (*filioque*) to be doctrinally correct, though he would confine the use of it to the province of theological polemics, and presumed that the council of Constantinople had not omitted it without the guidance of the Holy Spirit.¹ At the request of Charlemagne, *Alcuin* and *Theodulph* of Orleans defended the Occidental statement upon dogmatic and historico-dogmatic grounds.

2. Respecting the doctrine of the *Person of Christ*, the results that had been reached in the preceding periods were reaffirmed, in opposition to the new forms which the old errors had assumed, — Monothelitism (§ 106) being a revival of Monophysitism, and Adoptianism (§ 107) of Nestorianism.

3. The doctrine of the *Lord's Supper* had been maintained in its essential features in the preceding centuries, without, however, being presented in a technical form. During this period, within the *Greek Church* two views of this sacrament came into conflict with each other, — the one, that of the Constantinopolitan council of Iconoclasts, held in 754 in the reign of Constantine Copronymus, and the other, that advocated by the council of Image-worshippers, held at Nice in 787, and also by John of Damascus. In order to show that no other sensuous representation should be made of Christ, than that which he himself had offered in the Eucharist, the Iconoclastic council of 754 declared that Christ upon the eve of his passion had given this sacrament as the most vivid image and memorial of his person (*τύπος καὶ ἀνάμνησις*), calling the body of Christ in the consecrated bread a represented body (*θέσει σῶμα*), distinguishable from the natural body (*κατὰ φύσιν*), at the same time denominating the bread after its consecration a *θεῖον σῶμα*. To this

¹ Mansi Tom. XIV. 17 sq.

view, the later council of Image-worshippers, at Nice in 787, objected that it was incorrect to denominate the eucharistic emblem an image, *after* its consecration. *Previous* to consecration it was indeed an emblem; but after consecration it was in the strictest sense the body of Christ. This view was maintained still more elaborately by *John Damascene*. Bread and wine, he said ("Εκδοσις IV. 13, and Oratio III. De imaginibus), are not merely symbols of the body and blood of Christ. God comes down to the weakness of mortal men, and through the natural imparts the supernatural itself; the body of Christ in the Eucharist is the real body that was united with deity, not in the sense that the body of Christ descends from heaven, whenever the sacrament is celebrated, but the bread and wine are changed (μεταποιούνται) into the body and blood of Christ.¹

¹ The word μεταποιούνται was purposely employed to denote a change that was less than transubstantiation. The bread, according to Damascene, is united with deity, but in such a manner that two natures still remain.

CHAPTER SECOND.

SECTS.

§ 111.

PAULICIANS.

Photius; *Adversus Paulinistas* sc. recentiores *Manichaeos* lib. IV. (in Wolf's *Anecdota Graeca* Tom. I. II., and in Gallandi *Bibliotheca* Tom. XIII.); *Petrus Siculus* (about 870) *Historia Manichaeorum* (Ed. Rader. Ingolst. 1604, and Greseler Gotting. 1845; Winer und Engelhardt's *Journal* Bd. VII.; Schmidt *Historia Paulicianorum orientalium*; Gieseler, *Untersuchung*, etc., in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1829.

THIS period produced a new and remarkable sect, out of old elements from a preceding time. From the remnants of the Gnostico-Manichaeian parties in Syria and Armenia (Ancient Church, § 95), which had survived all the varied persecutions, the sect of *Paulicians* sprang in the seventh century.

The Gnostic and Manichaeian basis of Paulicianism is sufficiently apparent. Their doctrine of two eternal principles and of a Demiurge, and their theory of redemption,¹ evinced their connection with the earlier Gnostico-Manichaeian sects. With these general elements and ideas

¹ The distinction between a Demiurge, the author of the sensible creation and of Judaism, and the perfect God, from whom only the spiritual world and Christianity proceed, they regarded as the characteristic doctrine of their sect. In order to deliver man from the dominion of the Demiurge, and raise him to perfect freedom, the Redeemer appeared, and in a body of a higher and more ethereal substance than that of matter.

borrowed from the dualistic theories of Gnosticism and Manichaeism, which by the aid of an allegorizing exegesis and under the influence of their dogmatic idealism, they carried over into that portion of the Scriptures which they accepted,¹ the Paulicians united a professedly biblical mysticism, that opposed itself to the ceremonies and worship of the dominant church,² and to the historical Christianity as embodied in the ancient symbols; while, at the same time, they endeavored to introduce the actual, or supposed institutions of the apostolic churches; and particularly of the Marcionizing, or early Pauline (in the sense of Anti-Petrine) churches. In the practical working of their system, however, they were less anxious to establish the validity of their Gnostico-Manichaean dogmatics, than to oppose the many errors and superstitions of the existing catholic church, and to restore a church purified in accordance with the Biblical teachings.

Their name they derived, probably not from any particular one of their leaders, but from the Apostle Paul himself, — whose name might, however, naturally be a favorite one with their leaders generally. They claimed to be the true Pauline *Χριστοπολῖται*, in distinction from the *Ῥωμαῖοι*, the dominant church, or adherents of the Petrine state-religion. This supposition respecting the origin of their name is borne out by the fact that their leaders assumed the name of Paul's companions, — as *Sylvanus*, *Titus*, *Timothy*, etc., and that their principal settlements were called after the places that are mentioned in Paul's journeys, — as *Mananalis Achaia*, *Eibossa Macedonia*, *Mopsuestia Ephesus*, etc.

According to the somewhat mythically sounding account of Photius, the sect owed its origin, and its name also, to

¹ They rejected the Old Testament entirely; made appeal to the New Testament alone, especially to the teachings of Christ, accepting, however, only the gospels of Luke and John, and rejected the epistles of Peter as the writings of a false apostle.

² They rejected the worship of images, of the cross, of saints and relics, denounced fasts, monachism, and the doctrine of the perpetual virginity of Mary, and also abolished the priesthood and the outward observance of the two sacraments.

two brothers *Paul and John* of Samosata, who lived about the year 350, the sons of a Gnostic or Manichæan woman named Callinice. It is historically certain that, sometime after the middle of the seventh century, the Paulicians had for a leader an able man named *Constantine*, who lived not far from Samosata, in a Syrian village called Mananalis. This person having received a copy of the gospels and of the Pauline Epistles from a catholic deacon, was led by the study of them to purify his Manichæan theories, and to enliven them with a more practical spirit. Then assuming the name of *Sylvanus*, he labored with great zeal for twenty-seven years (perhaps from 657–684) as the head of the sect at Eibossa in Armenia. He was at length stoned to death by *Simeon*, an officer who had been sent to persecute the Paulicians by the emperor *Constantine Pogonatus*; but the officer himself, after a few years, was converted to Paulicianism, and became the head of the sect under the name of *Titus*. A new persecution under the emperor *Justinian II.* brought Simeon and many others to the stake. One of the principal members of the sect, *Paulus* by name, escaped, and labored with such zeal and success that, according to one statement, the sect first received its name from him. The emperor *Leo the Isorian* (717 †) showed favor to the Paulicians, because of their opposition to image-worship, and superstitious observances generally. He summoned to Constantinople, more for show than from earnest purpose, *Gegnaesius* named *Timothy*, the elder son of Paulus and the head of the sect, in order that he might make a defence of Paulicianism. By equivocal declarations and explanations, — the sect itself not being distinguished for strict truthfulness, but on the contrary inclined to blend illusory theories with deception in practice, — he was able to satisfy the patriarch respecting his own orthodoxy and that of his party, and was sent back under the safe conduct of the emperor. After the time of Gegnaesius, the Paulician sect was disorganized in various ways, by internal dissension and corruption, and particularly by the influence of many teachers of degenerate character, who carried to the last extreme the

Paulician opposition to the Old Testament law and the Mosaic ordinances respecting marriage. About the year 801 the Paulicians found a very able and energetic leader in *Sergius* of Galatia, a man who had probably been educated in the catholic church, and whose attention had been directed to the Scriptures by the remark of a Paulician woman, that the Bible was not intended for the priests alone. He became deeply interested in what he read, received the Pauline doctrine, and, taking the name of *Tychicus*, devoted himself with glowing zeal to the diffusion of practical Christian truth and to the promotion of a simple Christian morality, — yet not without a mixture of self-exaltation in claiming to be the Paraclete,¹ and being so regarded by his sect. The Paulicians spread rapidly at this time, the sect having been transplanted in 752, by the command of *Constantine Copronymus*, into Asia Minor and as far as Thrace. But even during the lifetime of Sergius, the persecutions of the Paulicians in the Greek empire, which, since the time of Leo the Isaurian had been less violent, were earnestly renewed by the emperor *Michael Rhangabe* (811–813), and *Leo the Armenian* (813–820); and, after his murder by a catholic in 835, the empress *Theodora* resolved in 844 to exterminate the Paulician name by a general persecution,² which was to close the series of enormities which the sect had been enduring for nearly two hundred years. Driven by this persecution, which was carried out with the direst cruelty, from the East Roman Empire, the Paulicians wandered into the domains of the Saracens, were welcomed by them as the natural enemies of the Greeks, and there, awaiting a happier future, founded amongst other places the strong city *Tephrica*. From this point, under the leadership of Carbeas, who had once been a general in the Greek

¹ Not the Paraclete in the sense of the Holy Ghost, however, but of an enlightened teacher promised by Christ to reform the corrupted Christianity. Neander III. 253.

² The number of Paulicians who were put to death by hanging, beheading, drowning, etc., is stated at one hundred thousand (Constantin Porphyrog. continuat. IV. 16, p. 103, Ed. Par.).

emperor's service, and of others after him, the Paulicians waged an unrelenting warfare, in conjunction with the Saracens against the bordering Greeks. Their doctrine struck root as a fruitful seed that was to germinate in succeeding centuries (§ 125).

FOURTH PERIOD : A. D. 814—1073.

SECTION FIRST.

The Spread of Christianity.

§ 112.

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS IN NORTHERN EUROPE.

Adami Bremensis Hist. eccles. praesertim Bremensis libb. IV. ; and De situ Daniae et reliquarum, quae trans Daniam sunt, regionum natura, moribus et religione. Ed. Fabricius Hamb. 1706.

THE earlier attempts by missionaries among the Frieslanders and Saxons to convert the Scandinavian races, particularly the *Danes*, and also the endeavors in the time of Charlemagne of a Jutland noble by the name of *Gorm* to acquire a more accurate knowledge of Christianity, had been without much effect ; and the occasional efforts to diffuse the gospel from the Frankish empire had been hindered by war. It was not until the reign of *Lewis the Pious* (914 †), that the political relations between the Franks and Danes became more friendly, and at an imperial diet at *Atigny*, in 822, the archbishop of *Ebbo* of Rheims was chosen as a missionary for *Denmark* and northern Europe, and confirmed to this office by pope *Paschalis* I. But his labors, too, were without important results, and it was only in consequence of special endeavors of the emperor Charlemagne, that a Danish king *Harald Klag* received baptism in 826 at the imperial castle of Ingelheim near Mayence. The emperor

persuaded him to take back a missionary with him to Denmark. The abbot *Wala* of Corvey, on the Weser, proposed for this work *Anschar*, or *Ansgar*, a pious monk and headmaster of the cloister school, who joyfully declared himself ready to undertake the dangerous service. Born in 801, educated until his fifth year by a pious mother, after a period of religious indifference awakened to the importance of invisible and eternal realities, first by celestial voices sounding in his ears in dreams and visions,¹ and then by the startling intelligence of the death of the great emperor Charlemagne, inwardly pointed to the missionary work by new and still more remarkable visions, — *Anschar* had already in the cloister given proofs of persevering diligence, earnestness in prayer, and meek and enduring charity, and he now made special preparation by prayer and study of the Scriptures for the new work assigned him. In the year 826, after enduring many hardships, he arrived in Denmark, accompanied by a monk *Aubert*, who had been stimulated by his example. But shut in on all sides by obstacles, he could not do much more than give instruction to native boys, whom he purchased and held for the purpose, in order to train them up as teachers. His first Christian school was founded in 827, at Hadeby or Schleswig. Even in these labors he was interrupted in 829 by the expulsion of Harald from his kingdom, and the return of *Aubert* to Germany on account of sickness; and hence, in 729, he gladly seized the opportunity that was offered to carry the gospel into Sweden. The care of the Danish mission was devolved for the present upon the monk *Gislemar*.

Sweden had already obtained some knowledge of Christianity, through Christian merchants and captives. *Lewis the Pious* had heard of the desire for Christian teachers expressed by many Swedes, and at his suggestion *Anschar* went to Sweden, accompanied by the monk *Witmar* of Cor-

¹ He thought, e. g., that he was sunk in a marshy fen; companies of the saints passed by him, and he spread out his arms longingly after them; but they pointed to the vanity and sin in him which rendered him unworthy of their heavenly society.

bie a monastery in France. While on their way, they were plundered of everything by pirates. Anschar lost all his books, thirty in number. His fellow-travellers wished to abandon the journey; but Anschar was not to be deterred. He landed at Birka, and met with a friendly reception from king Berno, and a fraternal one from Christian captives there. A provincial governor, named *Herigar*, became a convert, and upon his own estate laid the foundations of the first Swedish church. In the year 830, Anschar returned to Germany, for the purpose of putting the Swedish mission upon a firmer basis, and the emperor Lewis now carried out the design which his father had formed before him, and established in 831, under the authority of pope *Gregory IV.*, the *archbishopric of Hamburg* as the centre of northern missions. Anschar was appointed archbishop, and, together with *Ebbo*, was formally entrusted with the Christianization of the races of northern Europe. Ebbo deputed in his place his nephew *Gauzbert*, who was consecrated a bishop under the name of *Simon*, and sent to Sweden, while Anschar reserved for himself the more difficult work in Denmark.

In *Denmark*, the powerful king *Horick* for a long time showed great enmity towards Christianity. At the same time, the Normans devastated, first, the diocese, and afterwards (in 845) the city of *Hamburg*; and Anschar, to whom, owing to the poverty of his diocese the cloister of *Thorault* in *Flanders* had also been assigned for his support, but which in the division of the empire amongst the sons of Lewis had fallen to *Charles the Bald*, and by him was given to another person, took refuge on the estate of a noble lady of *Holstein*, from whence he visited his wasted diocese. By uniting the bishopric of *Bremen*, on its becoming vacant, with that of *Hamburg*, *Lewis the German* at length bettered the pecuniary condition of Anschar, who now devoted himself with greater zeal than ever to his missionary projects in northern Europe. By means of presents, and frequently by conducting negotiations for him, he acquired the entire confidence of *Horick*, and although the king did not himself accept Christianity, he yet allowed Anschar to

found a church in Schleswig, the influence of which was of great importance for the further spread of Christianity.

In *Sweden*, meanwhile, Gauzbert, after a season of successful labor, had been driven out in 845 by an uprising of the pagan population. *Ardgar*, who had previously been an eremite, was sent thither in 851 by Anschar, and labored with some results, but left the country after the death of his patron Herigar. As Gauzbert refused to undertake the Swedish mission again, Anschar took charge of it himself, accompanied by *Erimbert*, the nephew of Gauzbert. Though earnestly recommended by Horick to the Swedish king *Olaf*,¹ Anschar was, nevertheless, received inimicably upon arriving in Sweden. A pagan fanatic had instigated the people against the enemies of their ancient gods, so that they set themselves in violent opposition to the foreign deity of the Christians, and were for choosing another new divinity from among their deceased kings. But Anschar was unwearied in labor and prayer, and at length a popular assembly summoned by the king for the decision of the question, at which some Swedes acknowledged that they had been saved at sea by the god of the Christians, conceded the liberty of preaching Christianity, and of founding a church. Anschar now left Erimbert in charge of the missionary work in Sweden, and dedicated the rest of his life, after the year 854, to the conversion of the Danes, — still retaining his bishopric of Hamburg and Bremen.

Horick II. of Denmark, owing to the influence exerted upon him by a stadtholder, Havi, who was inimical to the Christians, did not inherit the friendly sentiments of his father. The church at Schleswig was closed, and the Christian clergy were compelled to flee. A fortunate change in the stadtholdership restored the previous feeling on the part of the king and government, and Anschar again carried on his labors with courage and energy. While he did not forget wants that were near by, but, notwithstanding his pov-

¹ Horick wrote saying: "I have never in my whole life seen so good a man, and have never in any one found such truthfulness."

erty, ransomed captives, built cloisters, and founded hospitals for the poor and sick, still less did he neglect the necessities of those that were more distant. He sent missionaries into all parts of Denmark, training up native-born Danes for this purpose in preference to all others, and teaching them to support themselves by the labor of their own hands, — himself setting the example by weaving nets. Going about in clothing of hair-cloth, and living upon bread and water, by his abstemiousness he provided the means of support for his messengers to the heathen, and of making presents to the pagan nobles. Shortly before his death, — which occurred after being confined to his bed for four months, — he commended with paternal love the Northern mission to the German king *Lewis*, and to the German bishops; and with fervent prayer, and utterances of love toward the poor who stood around, and unmeasured faith in the divine word, and strengthened by the sacrament of the Supper, he departed silently and gently on the 3d of February, 865.¹

The work which Anschar left behind him could not, like that of Boniface, — to whom he was not equal in the power of producing *external* results, — defy, like a splendid fortress, the storms of the future; yet in conflict with great obstacles, in the midst of great toils, and with humble pa-

¹ His earnest desire, cherished from boyhood, to die a martyr's death, was not granted him. His death occurred on the day of the feast of the purification of the Virgin Mary, when he had prepared for all the priests and the poor an entertainment. The day and night previous he had spent mostly in conversation with his friends, respecting missions among the heathen. On the approach of death, he joined in the liturgy and penitential psalms, and in chanting the *Te deum laudamus* and the Athanasian symbol, and then partook of the emblems of the body and blood of the Lord. His last words were: "Lord, remember me according to thy loving kindness! Lord be merciful to me! Into thy hands I commit my spirit; thou hast redeemed me, O thou faithful God!" Of Anschar's writings there are extant only a letter, and the life of Willehad (§97). For his biography see: *Vita Anscharii* (in *Acta Sanctorum* Febr. Tom. I. p. 559, and *Pertz Monument*. Tom. II. p. 698) by Rembert his successor; *Münter Kirchengeschichte von Dänem. u. Norw.*; *Neander Denkwürdigkeiten*; *Reuter dahl Ansgarius*; *Kraft Narratio de Ansgario*; *Daniel Ansgar das Ideal eines Glaubensboten*; *Klippel Lebensbeschreibung des Erzbischofs Ansgar*.

tience and self-denying love when the results seemed to be small and discouraging, he consecrated his whole life to the service of the Lord, in laying the first foundations of what was finally a grand structure, and his work was abiding.

The inferior force and activity of the immediate successors of Anschar, the unpropitious circumstances under which they labored, and the incursions of the Normans into the diocese of Hamburg-Bremen, prevented a rapid growth of the Scandinavian Church. Nevertheless, in the course of this period, it came to be firmly and generally established.

In *Denmark*,¹ king *Gorm the Elder* violently persecuted the Christians until the emperor *Henry I.*, about 934, compelled him to tolerate Christianity. Schleswig became a dependency of the German empire, and a Christian colony was sent to it. The excellent *Unni*, archbishop of Hamburg and Bremen, when upon a visit to Denmark, endeavored unsuccessfully to render king Gorm more favorable to Christianity; but he succeeded in winning over to his cause *Harald Blaatand*, the son and successor of Gorm (941–991). After an unsuccessful war with the emperor *Otto I.*, followed by a treaty of peace, in 972, very favorable to the Christian church, Harald received baptism, and henceforth labored — in connection with the energetic *Adaldag*, archbishop of Hamburg and Bremen, who now consecrated several bishops for Denmark, among whom was the zealous *Liafdag* of Ripen — for the Christian education of his people with so much zeal, that the heathen party, and his own son *Sweno* their favorite, exasperated by his course, drove him from the throne. Sweno (991–1014) now proceeded to destroy all Christian institutions, and the earnest remonstrances of the archbishop *Libentius* of Hamburg were of no avail. It was not until towards the close of his reign, that, owing to political considerations, he became more moderate, and even favorable to Christianity. This attitude of the Danish gov-

¹ Compare Saxo Grammaticus († about 1204) *Hist. Danicæ* libb. XVI. Ed. Stephanus Sov. 1644, also Ed. Klotz. Hal. 1771; Pontoppidan *Annales ecclesiæ Danicæ diplomatice* Havn 1741; Münter *Kirchengeschichte von Dänem. u. Norw.*

ernment was made permanent by Sweno's son *Canute the Great* (1014–1035), who had been educated in the Christian kingdom of England conquered by the Danes, and who had married *Emma*, a Christian princess, the widow of the English king Ethelred. Canute's favorable feeling towards Christianity was still further strengthened by a pilgrimage to Rome, which he took in 1027, by which he was brought into closer connection with the great centre of western Christendom.

In Sweden,¹ after the death of Anschar, the number of Christians quietly increased, without much external change in the church. The archbishop *Unni* of Hamburg, recommended by Harald the son of the Danish king Gorm, labored in Sweden with success, but died there about 940. His successors sent missionaries, who followed in his footsteps. King *Olaf Skautconnung* received baptism about 1008, the first Christian king of Sweden, and founded the first Swedish bishopric at *Skara*, in a part of the country which his heathen subjects surrendered to him by stipulation, for the establishment of Christian institutions,—all the rest of the country being left open to the practice of any religion. The king carried out his missionary plans chiefly by the aid of English clergymen from Norway. Nevertheless, paganism continued to exist for a long time, the influence of an ancient renowned temple at Upsala contributing greatly to its support; and, besides, many of the preachers of Christianity, to whom the natural reverence of the Swedes for everything of a religious nature afforded the opportunity of proclaiming the truth at popular assemblies, were wanting in fidelity and zeal (See Adam. Brem. Hist. Eccl. Lib. ii. c. 229). Only a few were like that priest of the above-mentioned temple, who, directed in a dream to the God of the Christian, and by him healed of mental blindness, went through the land unweariedly proclaiming the nothingness of idols, and the omnipotence of the Christian deity,—an

¹ Ericus Olai (a clergyman of Upsala in the fifteenth century) *Historia Suecorum*; Claudii Oernhjålm *Hist. Sueon. Gothorumque eccl.*; Geijer *Schwedens Urgeschichte*.

example which the Christian zeal of the Swedish bishop *Adalward*, who had been sent from Bremen, made good use of. At length, king *Inge* in 1075 prohibited all idol-worship, and enforced the prohibition.

The inhabitants of *Norway*,¹ had acquired some knowledge of Christianity while engaged in their predatory wars, and in the 10th century many of their leaders attempted its introduction among them. The first Christian king of Norway was *Hacon the Good*, the son of *Harald Haarfager* the first sole king of Norway. *Hacon* had been educated in England, and had received baptism there, but ventured to observe Christian worship only in secret and under the concealment of artifice. After the year 945, he proposed to his people that they should adopt Christianity, but they refused, and even compelled the king himself to participate in one of their heathen festivals. The king now conceived the purpose of introducing Christianity by force ; but he lost his life, about the year 969, in a battle with foreign enemies, dying in deep contrition for his momentary denial of Christ, and reconciled with his people. The love which his people cherished towards him now began to operate favorably for Christianity. Soon afterwards, Norway was subjugated by the Danish king *Harald* (in 967), who formally introduced the Christian religion in 975 ; but the valiant Norwegian chief *Hacon*, whom *Harald* had appointed as his viceroy, in his wrath shattered in pieces all Christian institutions, and broke up the Danish rule. The Norwegian king *Olaf Tryggweson* (995–1000) again put an end to the confusion and disorder of heathenism. In one of his earlier warlike expeditions, *Olaf* had been presented by *Thangbrand*, a Bremen ecclesiastic, with a shield upon which the figure of Christ was embossed. To this he attributed his deliverance in many dangers ; and, having succeeded in overcoming and slaying *Hacon*, attended by *Thangbrand*, he proceeded with

¹ *Snorre Sturleson* (of Iceland, † 1241) *Heimskringla* Ed. Schöningh Hafn. 1777 sq. 5 Vols. fol. ; translated into German by Mohnike, and also by Wachter. This is a collection of the traditions (Sagas, Eddai) respecting the Norwegian kings.

great zeal to establish Christianity throughout the kingdom. He travelled in person through his realm, exhorting his nobles to the only obedience worthy of freemen, and urging them to become the knights of the Almighty, whose servant he was himself proud to be, and who had made them, instead of bondmen, to be the brethren of his Son. But, by employing force and cruelty against the pagan priests, he weakened the impression which his zeal had made upon the people, and paved the way for the invasion of his kingdom by the kings of Sweden and Denmark. He perished in battle in the year 1000. The new rulers labored neither for the suppression nor the extension of the Church in Norway. In 1017, Norway received again a native-born ruler in *Olaf Haraldson*, and he completed the establishment of Christianity in Norway, by founding churches and schools, with the assistance and advice of bishops and priests brought from England, — although by his unchristian violence and despotic severity, which were the natural effects of his vehement energy, he often embittered the pagans against the new religion. He organized and arranged an ecclesiastical system for the natives, with the coöperation of bishop *Grimkild*. Nevertheless, the opposition of the pagan portion of the population resulted in getting the kingdom into the hands of *Canute the Great*. Olaf, already on his way to Jerusalem, was summoned back by a dream, and led his army, their shields and helmets emblazoned with the sign of the cross, against the Danes. He fell in battle, in 1033. But after his death, with hatred against the Danes, new love for Olaf arose in the hearts of the Norwegians. They now worshipped him as a martyr, and of their own accord insisted upon the wider spread of Christianity, and its permanent establishment. This previously piratical people now learned to love peace, and to be content with its poverty (*Adam. Brem. de situ Danorum* c. 96).

During this period, Christianity penetrated also into a country still further north. The island of *Iceland*,¹ though

¹ *Kristnisaga* Historia religionis Christianae in Isl. introd. (written in the fourteenth century); *Finni Johannaei Hist. eccl. Islandiae*; *Münter Geschichte der Einführung des Christenthums in Dänemark und Norwegen*.

perhaps it had been visited still earlier by Irish monks, had been discovered about the year 862 by Norwegians, and soon after was occupied by a Norwegian colony. In 981 a native of the island, *Thorwald*, who in one of his adventurous expeditions into Saxony had been baptized by bishop Frederick, made some attempts to introduce the Christian religion into his native land, being accompanied thither by the bishop. Afterward the Norwegian king *Olaf Tryggweson*, about the year 996, assisted by an Icelander named *Stefner*, endeavored, though without permanent results owing to his violent methods, to Christianize the nation. About the year 1000, two enlightened Icelanders, named *Gissur* and *Hialti*, having been previously banished from their country, came back as missionaries from Norway into their native land, and soon a general assembly of the nation, composed of representatives of both the pagan and the Christian parties, adopted Christianity as the national religion, for the sake of peace. After this, Christianity continued to spread more and more, although with a remarkable mixture of paganism in it, under the influence of zealous bishops; and Icelandic ecclesiastics, betaking themselves to foreign regions for theological education, brought back with them the rudiments of theological science.

During this period, about the year 1000, Christianity also passed from the north of Europe into *Greenland*. *Gumbjörn*, a Norwegian sea-captain, had discovered at a distance the mountainous coast of Greenland, in 877; next *Eric the Red*, an Icelandic freebooter, made a full discovery of the region in 982; and his son *Leif*, through the inducement of the Norwegian king *Olaf Tryggweson* having received baptism with his whole ship's company, founded a Christian church, at Leif, in 999. Under king *Olaf the Saint* († 1033), the church at Leif was greatly strengthened, and Christianity was extended into the southerly districts of Greenland, *Markland*, *Helluland*, and *Vinland*. In 1055, the Greenlanders received a bishop *Albert* from Hamburg-Bremen.¹

¹ The connection of Greenland with the Christian world continued without

§ 113.

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS AMONG THE SLAVES.¹

The Christian church was founded during this period, among many important Slavonic, or Tartar-Slavonic races, and missionary undertakings among several of these met with great success in the very outset. Two monks of Constantinople, *Cyrl* (previously named Constantine) and *Methodius* his brother,² in the ninth century, did more than any others towards the evangelization of the Slavonic population, both of them preaching the gospel in the vernacular tongue, *Cyrl* inventing an alphabet, and translating the Bible into the Slavonic language.

The *Chazars*, originating in the region north of the Caucasus, and from the ninth century onward inhabiting the Crimea and the adjacent country, had, through their wars with the Greeks, and in other ways, obtained some knowledge of Christianity, and being disturbed by Jewish and Mohammedan proselytes, asked the Greek emperor to send them a missionary. The emperor *Michael* III., then under the guardianship of *Theodora*, sent *Cyrl* to them, probably about the year 848, by whose preaching a considerable portion of the people were led to receive Christianity, although

interruption until the fifteenth century. In the middle of the fourteenth century, the black death desolated the whole country, and unusual amounts of ice rendered communication with Norway exceedingly difficult, so that after the year 1410 all authentic accounts of the colony in Greenland ceased. In the beginning of the sixteenth century, attempts were made re-discover the ancient Greenland, — first by the bishop of Frondheim under the patronage of Christian II. of Denmark; next at the close of the sixteenth century by Frederick II.; then again in the beginning of the seventeenth century by Christian IV., and still later by Frederick III. and Christian V. It was not however until the eighteenth century, that Christianity was revived in Greenland by the Moravian brethren.

¹ Ignatijevic de Tkalec De religione Christiana in Slavis introducta.

² Vita Constantini, by a contemporary, in Acta Sanctorum Mart. T. II. p. 19 sqq. Compare Dobrowski Cyrill und Method der Slawen Apostel; and Mähr Legende von Cyrill und Method; Philaret Cyrill und Methodius die Apostel der Slawen (translated from the Russian).

in the tenth century we find that many of the Chazars were Jews, Mohammedans, or Pagans.

The *Bulgarians* in Thrace, on the western borders of the Black Sea, originally a Tartar people from the region between the Caspian and Black seas, had been made acquainted with Christianity by Greek captives, and particularly by the bishop *Manuel*, who died a martyr in the first half of the ninth century. Many of them professed Christianity, but were compelled to seal their profession with martyrdom. After the year 860, the condition of the Christian Bulgarians became more favorable. The sister of the Bulgarian king *Bogoris*, having been converted to Christ during her long captivity at Constantinople, on her return from captivity endeavored, with the assistance of *Methodius*, to make an impression upon her brother in behalf of the truth. A pinching famine in his realm, and then a representation of the last judgment, which *Methodius*, who was a painter, had painted for the king, instead of the wild hunting scene he had desired, inclined *Bogoris* to listen to the preaching of the gospel. He received baptism in 863, under the name of *Michael*, and, after a bloody but successful conflict with a portion of his heathen subjects, succeeded in bringing his nation over to Christianity. But the arrival of missionaries of various nationalities and characters, — Armenian, German, Greek, and Roman, — began to divide and unsettle the people, and the king hesitated whether to join himself to Constantinople or to Rome. The greater simplicity of the Roman worship, together with political considerations, determined him to the Western Christianity. In 865 he entered into correspondence with pope *Nicholas I.*, — a step that resulted afterwards in important disputes and quarrels between the Greek and Latin churches, — who gave him wise and Christian advice, approving the course he had pursued, and warning him against overestimating outward ceremonies, and exhorting him to mildness towards his subjects, and forbearance towards his enemies. Nevertheless, in the end, the unwearied efforts of the Greek emperor *Basil the Macedonian* prevailed, and the Bulgarians received a

Greek archbishop and bishops. Under the reign of Bogoris, *Clement* († 916), a pupil of Methodius, labored as the archbishop of the Bulgarians, — having been previously driven out from the Moravians (see *infra*).

The *Moravians*,¹ made subject to the Frankish rule by Charlemagne, but afterwards an independent and powerful race, dwelling in what is now northern Austria, about the middle of the ninth century, under the lead of the prince Radislaw, or Rastices, joined themselves, from political reasons, to the Greek church; and this event offered an opportunity for sending, in 853, *Cyril* and *Methodius* to them as missionaries, who gave them preaching, worship, and a version of the Scriptures in their own Slavonic language. Very soon after this, however, the Moravians seem to have separated from the Greek church and gone over to the Roman; for, in the year 868 Cyril and Methodius are reported to have made a journey to Rome at the invitation of the pope. Cyril remained at Rome until his death, and Methodius returned to the Moravian church as its archbishop. Radislaw's successor, *Swatopluck*, or *Zwentibold* (870), at first showed hostility towards the Christians, but afterwards treated them favorably. The neighboring clergy of the German church, who had been brought into connection with the Moravians through the missionary operations of the archbishop of Salzburg, now complained to the pope of Methodius, because he did not use either the Greek or Latin language, but the profane Slavonic, in the public worship; and the pope, *John XIII.*, in a letter to the Moravian church, forbade the use of Slavonic in the mass, but allowed it in the sermon. But Methodius in 877 justified his course, in person, at Rome, and received from the pope a declaration favoring the entire Slavonic ritual, — with the exception that the gospel should not only be read in Slavonic, but should be first recited in Greek or Latin out of respect. On his return in 860, however, Methodius fell into new difficulties with the German bishops and clergy. These latter being jealous of his influ-

¹ *Pilarz et Morawetz Moraviae Hist. eccl. et, pol.*

ence, desired to establish an independent Moravian archbishopric; and gaining influence with king Swatopluck, through his close connection with *Arnulph* duke of Carnathia, and afterwards emperor of the Germans, they sowed the seeds of disunion between Methodius and his sovereign. This led to a journey of Methodius in 881 to Rome, and from this time he disappears from view. The Moravian kingdom was conquered in 908, and partitioned between Bohemia and Hungary, and under the new dominion the Slavonic ritual continued only in some individual churches.

From the Moravians, Christianity extended to the Bohemians,¹ a people who had stood in friendly connection with the Moravians, but were conquered by them about the year 890. When *Borziwoi*, their duke, in 894 took the oath of allegiance to the king of the Moravians, he was made acquainted with Christianity by Methodius, and received baptism. Having been compelled to flee to the Moravians by his pagan subjects, he was instructed still more fully by Methodius, and upon returning to his people labored earnestly in founding the church among them. Nevertheless, it was a long time before Christianity became dominant in Bohemia. After the death in 952 of *Wratislaw*, the successor of *Borziwoi*, a heathen and a Christian party were engaged in violent opposition to each other. At the head of the heathen party stood *Wratislaw's* younger son *Boleslaw*, who had been educated as a pagan by his mother *Drahomira*; and at the head of the Christian party stood *Wenzeslaw*, the elder brother of *Boleslaw*, who had been educated as a Christian by his grandmother *Ludwilla*, the widow of *Borziwoi*. *Wenzeslaw* fell by his brother's hand² in 938, and the rule of *Boleslaw the Cruel* restored the supremacy of heathenism. An unsuccessful war with the German emperor *Otto I.* compelled *Boleslaw* to make a

¹ *Cosmas Prag.* (†1125) *Chron. Bohemor*, in *Script. rer. Bohem.* Tom. I.; *Dobner Hageki annales Bohem. illustrati*; *Ejusd. Monumenta hist. Bohemiae*; *Palacky Geschichte von Böhmen*.

² *Vita Sanct. Ludmillae et Sanct. Wenceslai*, *Acta Sanctorum* Sept. T. V. p. 354; T. VII. p. 825.

peace in 950, one of the conditions of which was the restoration of the rights of the Christians. Under the reign of his son *Boleslaw II. the Pious*, the church became dominant, and in 973 acquired a permanent foundation, by the establishment of the bishopric (afterwards archbishopric) of Prague, — the pope stipulating for the introduction of the Romish liturgy ; yet the complete extirpation of heathenism was only gradual and slow.

Fugitives from Moravia, upon the downfall of that kingdom, carried the seeds of Christianity to the *Poles*.¹ A further knowledge of the gospel was afterwards imparted to them from Bohemians. The Polish duke *Miceslaw*, influenced by his consort *Dambrowska*, a Christian princess from Bohemia, received baptism in 966. He both recommended and commanded his people to follow his example, and founded at *Posen* the first Polish bishopric ; to which were added, in the eleventh century, the archbishoprics of *Gnesen* and *Cracow*. The Polish church, also, favored connection with Rome.

The conversion of the *Russians*,² once more proceeded from the Greek empire. From hence they had obtained their first knowledge of Christianity, and soon after the middle of the ninth century they are said to have received a Greek bishop. The Greek emperor *Basil the Macedonian* (867–886) continued missionary efforts among them ; yet the hostile relations that existed between the Greeks and Russians prevented for a long time any great success. Even the baptism of the grand princess *Olga* (who took the name of *Helena*), at Constantinople in 955, and who, towards the close of her life, ventured to employ a Christian priest only secretly, did not determine her people as a whole for Christianity ; but her uncle, the grand prince *Vladimir*, in his search for the true religion, was induced in 980 to receive baptism (under the name of *Basil*) and Christianity according to the

¹ Ditmar (†1018) *Chronicon* ; Martini Galli (about 1130) *Chronicon Pol.* ; Friese *Kirchengeschichte von Polen* ; Röpell *Geschichte von Polen*.

² Nestor (about 1113) *Annales* (to 1110) 5 vols. 4to. translated into German by Schlözer. Strahl *Geschichte der russ. Kirche*.

Greek ritual, by the reports which his embassy to Constantinople brought back respecting the splendor of the Christian worship, to which they had been admitted in all its parts in the church of St. Sophia. Strengthened in his new views and purposes by his consort, the Greek princess *Anna*, he invited Christian bishops and ecclesiastics into his kingdom, and, besides many bishoprics, founded the archbishoprics of *Kiew* and *Novgorod*. His people now presented themselves on the banks of the Dnieper, and received baptism with stolid submission. After the death of Vladimir in 1015, his son *Jaroslav* (1019–1054), and his grandson *Isäslaw* (1054–1077), completed the work in Russia which he had commenced. The monastery at Kiew, from the middle of the eleventh century and onward, became the nursery of Russian literature, as well as of Russian bishops.

The *Hungarians*,¹ originating from central Asia north of the Caucasus, had become acquainted with Christianity, towards the close of the ninth century and onward, through their wars with the people bordering upon the region which they now inhabit. The first efforts towards their conversion proceeded from the Greek church. Their prince *Gylas* received baptism at Constantinople about 950, and the patriarch sent back with him the monk *Hierotheus* as bishop. *Sarolta* the daughter of Gylas, although her knowledge of the gospel was very imperfect, nevertheless influenced her husband *Geysa*, the duke of Hungary (972–998), in favor of Christianity; and under his auspices, the active missionary efforts of *Pilgrim* bishop of Passau, and others, the Christian church made important progress in Hungary. It finally obtained a firm and permanent establishment, in dependence upon Rome, through the son of Geysa, *Stephen the Saint* (997–1038), who conquered in battle the large pagan party, invited ecclesiastics and monks into his kingdom from every quarter, and extended Christianity first to *Transylvania* and afterwards to *Wallachia*. During the political convulsions that suc-

¹ *Johannes de Thwrocz Chronica Hungarorum*; *Mailath Geschichte der Magyaren*.

ceeded the death of Stephen, from 1045 to 1060, paganism made spasmodic attempts to recover itself, but they were quelled by force.

The *Sclavonic-German*, or *Wendish*¹, races in Northern Germany, dwelling on the Elbe, Saal, Havel, and Oder, made persevering resistance to all Christian efforts and influences. These races had been forced, as often as Charlemagne had conquered them, to receive Christian institutions; and thus a steady hatred of Christianity was generated by the compulsory method in which it came before them. After the victory over the people by the emperor *Henry I.*, the emperor *Otto I* established among them, by royal authority, the bishoprics of *Havelburg* in 946, of *Brandenburg* in 949, of *Oldenburg*, and about 968 the still more important sees of *Meissen*, *Merseburg* and *Zeitz*, together with the archbishopric of *Magdeburg*. But a general uprising of the Wends under *Mistiwoi*, in 983, once more annihilated the hopes of the church; and, too late to repair the desolations he had wrought, *Mistowoi* himself returned in deep penitence to the Christian faith, in which he had been educated. Happier times seemed to be coming on, when his uncle *Gottschalk*, — who had been educated as a Christian at *Luneburg*, but had left the monastery in 1038 in order to incite his people to rebellion, though afterwards becoming a sincere believer, — ascended the throne of the great *Wendish* kingdom which he had succeeded in founding in 1047. *Gottschalk* caused the gospel to be preached to his people by German ecclesiastics, he himself often acting as their interpreter; and at the same time he increased the number of bishoprics, founding those of *Ratzburg* and *Mecklenburg*. But soon the great prince of the Wends fell a sacrifice to his Christian zeal, being murdered by the pagans at *Lentzen* on June 9th, 1066. All Christian institutions

¹ *Ditmar Chronicon*; *Adam of Bremen Hist. eccl.*; *Wittichind* († 1000) *Annales de rebus Saxonum gestis*; *Helmold Chron. Slavorum*; *Giesebrecht Wendische Geschichten aus den Jahren 780–1182*; *Spieker Kirchengeschichte der Mark Brandenburg*; *Wiggers Kirchengeschichte Mecklenburgs*.

were once more ruthlessly overthrown, and the ancient altars were consecrated anew with the blood of Christian priests.¹

See ¹ At the close of the sketch of missions among the Gothic and Scandanavian races, the following resumé will be convenient: *Augustine's* term of missionary service was nine years (596-605); and his field of labor was England (Anglo-Saxons). *Columban's* term of service was fifty years (590-640); and his fields of labor were Burgundy, Switzerland, and Northern Italy. *Willibrord's* term of service was nearly sixty years (680-739); and his field of labor was Friesland. *Boniface's* term of service was forty years (715-755); and his fields of labor were Friesland, Thuringia, and Hessa. *Anschar's* term of service was nearly forty years (826-865); and his fields of labor were Denmark and Sweden.
— *Translator.*

SECTION SECOND.

Church Polity.

§ 114.

THE PAPAL CONSTITUTION.

THE idea of the Papacy, which had been formed in the preceding period, came so near to a complete and universal realization during this period, that the Papal constitution and laws were set forth in a *new book of ecclesiastical law*. This, on the one hand, maintained the church's independence of the state and the dignity and inviolability of the clerical power; and upon the other, inculcated the supremacy of the Roman church over all others, while it limited the authority of the metropolitan bishops, by teaching them subjection to the patriarchs and the pope. This supremacy of the Roman church, and of the pope as the universal bishop, was claimed as proceeding immediately from Christ himself, and not from arrangements of a later day, and carried with it the right of ultimate decision in all ecclesiastical affairs, not merely in regard to the laity, but to bishops themselves of every grade.

This new book of ecclesiastical law¹ was published under the venerated name of *Isidore* of Seville (§ 104); and the name was not ill chosen. The collection of Roman decretals by *Dionysius Exiguus* (Ancient Church § 71), which as early as the sixth century had acquired almost universal authority in the West, had naturally undergone some modi-

¹ Edited in *Epp. decretales ac reserr. pontt. Rom.*

fications, particularly by the addition of the laws and decisions of provincial churches. Among the revisions of this collection, the French and Spanish were the most distinguished. A new revision, which introduced many modifications, was published in Spain between the year 633 and 636, as the book of ecclesiastical law for the Spanish church, under the name of *Isidore* of Seville. As this edition had acquired great reputation from the influence of this name, the last collection of all, made in the ninth century, was craftily sent forth under the same authority.

But while all the earlier revisions of the Dionysian collection bore the marks of their substantial genuineness, the new Isidorean collection which now appeared carried the proofs of its spuriousness in both its mutilations and its additions.¹ The earlier collections contained the decretals of the Roman bishops from the time of Siricius (383) only; but this one professed to give the official letters of all the Roman bishops up to the time of the apostles, — letters that had never been heard of before, letters in which Roman bishops of the first centuries speak in the Frankish Latin of the eighth and ninth centuries, letters in which they describe ecclesiastical and political affairs in accordance with the condition of things in mediaeval France, letters in which they quote Scripture in a post Jerome version, letters in which the Roman bishop Victor, who lived about the year 200, writes respecting the Easter controversy to the Alexandrine bishop Theophilus, who died about the year 400.

That this Isidorean collection is *Pseudo-Isidorean* there is no doubt. But though it is settled that the work is one of error and deception, the question may still arise whether it is the product of sheer and disguised forgery, or whether the author of it was so involved in the then existing condition of things, as to be unable to view the past with an unbiassed eye, and really supposed that the ecclesiastical constitution of his time had been that of the church from the first.

¹ It contains ninety-six entirely new decretals; viz.: sixty-one from Clemens Romanus to Sylvester I. (314), and thirty-five from Sylvester to Gregory I., not to mention the additions to the already existing decretals.

The *time* when the Pseudo-Isidorean decretals were composed can be determined only approximately. A passage from the decisions of a synod held at Paris in 829 *seems* to be cited in them; a synod of Frankish bishops at Chiersy in 857 quotes a passage from them as authoritative; a work upon ecclesiastical law composed in 845 alludes to them as in existence; and a council held at Aix la Chapelle in 837 appears to have made use of them, while certain documents which Wala abbot of Corvey sent in 834 to Gregory IV. show traces of their spirit and tendency. From all these data, it may be concluded that their origin falls between the years 829 and 857. It is probable, moreover, that they were formed successively, rather than all at one time. This would accord better with the manner in which such collections were formed generally, and would explain how it was possible, so late as the ninth century, to add spurious decretals to the genuine ones. In respect to the *author* of the decretals, it is most probable, from the language and the ecclesiastico-political character of the collection, and from other considerations, that it was an ecclesiastic of the Frankish church. Perhaps, also, a certain deacon of Mayence, *Benedict Levita*, may have been concerned in their construction; for in his collection of ecclesiastical ordinances issued in 845, not only many passages from the decretals appear, but there is also a studied effort to obtain authority for them. But inasmuch as the church at Mayence was an archbishopric, it would be difficult upon this supposition to account for the opposition of the decretals to the metropolitan constitutions, unless we suppose that Levita was influenced by personal considerations. At all events, after the Eastern Frankish church, that of Rome is the only one that with any plausibility can lay claim to the authorship of the Pseudo-Isidorean decretals. It is possible that the idea of them as a whole proceeded from the former, and was seized and realized by the latter; or it may be that the converse is the truth, and it was a Roman idea embodied by the Frankish mind. But the problem of their authorship is so complicated that it has not been, and never will be, completely solved.

The uncritical age in which they appeared cited the Pseudo-Isidorean decretals as unquestionably genuine,—*Nicholas I.* (858) being the first pope to do so,—and the doubts that were raised respecting their authenticity by those few individuals who suffered from the theory of church government contained in them, were wholly overborne. Their authority and influence constantly spread and increased with the lapse of time, until the Reformation, when the Magdeburg Centuriators¹ demonstrated their spuriousness. Afterwards, the Jesuit *Turrianus*² attempted to maintain their authority, but he was so thoroughly refuted by *Blondell*³ that even Roman Catholic writers concede their falsity.⁴

§ 115.

THE POPES.

THE feeble rule of the emperor *Lewis the Pious*, who humbled himself all the more before the authority of the church, in proportion as such powerful champions as the abbot *Wala* of Corvey and the sagacious archbishop *Agobard* of Lyons represented its claims, must necessarily promote the growth of the papal constitution. Pope *Gregory IV.* (827–844) endeavored to make his authority decisive in the contest between Lewis and his sons; and although the result by no means corresponded with his wishes, nevertheless the papal authority evidently strengthened the opponents of Lewis, and sanctified the undertaking of his sons in the eyes of the people,—an example that was of use to the popes of succeeding times.

¹ Centur. Magd. II. 7; III. 7 *Calvin* also (Institut. IV. 7, 11) had previously noticed the spurious elements in them.

² *Turrianus* Libb. V. adv. Magdeburgenses pro. epp. decretal. pontificum apostolicor., Flor. 1572.

³ *Blondellus* Pseudoisidorus et Turrianus vapulantes, Genev. 1628.

⁴ *Bellarmin* surrendered them as authority. Their spuriousness is allowed by the two brothers *Ballerini*, *Möhler*, *Hefele*, *Rosshirt*, etc.

Gregory IV. was followed by *Sergius* II. in 844, *Leo* IV. in 847, and *Benedict* III. in 855. Between the two last, a female pope *Johanna* is said to have filled the papal chair. According to an old tradition she was a German woman of Mayence, who went to Athens disguised in male attire, studied there with great success, and afterwards acquired so great reputation at Rome for her learning that she was chosen pope under the name of *John*. But although this story is related by writers from the middle of the eleventh century till into the thirteenth, at first without much coloring but afterwards with a suspicious particularity of detail; and although many memorials of a later day, and some peculiar ceremonies employed in the consecration of the popes might, certainly, remind of such a thing; it is nevertheless in all probability a pure invention, — because, the first witnesses do not testify until two hundred years after the alleged occurrence; because even the embittered Greek polemical writers of the ninth and tenth centuries, in all their attacks upon the Roman church, make no mention of a female pope; because the peculiarity of the above mentioned memorials and ceremonies can be otherwise explained, while no break can be shown in the series of popes; and because, lastly, the origin of the story can be accounted for upon the supposition that it was a satire upon the licentiousness of the popes of the first half of the tenth century, viz: *John* X., XI., and XII., and the influence of shameless women over them.¹

The Papacy received a new impulse under the rule of the vigorous pope *Nicholas* I. (858–867), who was not only the first to apply successfully the principles of the Pseudo-Isidorean decretals, but also to do it in a righteous cause. *Lothaire* II., king of Lothringia, for the sake of the adul-

¹ One of the most attractive of the concubines of Pope John XII. received the sobriquet of Popess Joanna, because of her influence in ecclesiastical affairs; and from this the story may have arisen. It was however credited to such a degree that Pope John XX., in 1279, called himself John XXI. Among the works upon this subject, the most important are: *Blondel Joanna Papissa*; *Liebnitz Flores sparsi in tumulum Papissae*; *Spanheim Dissertatio de Joanna Papissa*.

tress *Waldrade*, had repudiated his wife *Thietberga*. The two archbishops, *Gunther* of Cologne, and *Thietgaud* of Treves, together with several bishops, had allowed themselves to be made the instruments of his lusts, and in a synod at *Aix* in 862 had pronounced a separation between *Lothaire* and *Thietberga*, notwithstanding the protest of *Hincmar* bishop of Rheims. The injured wife appealed to the pope, who immediately ordered a new investigation of the matter at the council of *Metz*, in 863, under the guidance of the papal legates. But these latter were probably bribed, and the preceding unrighteous decision was re-affirmed at *Metz*. Hereupon *Nicholas* deposed *Gunther* and *Thietgaud*, and declared the decision of the synod to be null and void, and shameful. The deposed prelates succeeded for a while in gaining over to their cause the emperor *Lewis II.*, the brother of *Lothaire*. But the menacing advances of *Lewis* with his army towards Rome did not terrify the pope; and neither did the loud protests of the embittered archbishops, who claimed to be his equals, disturb him. He did not rest until the Lothringian bishop had humbly sought papal absolution, and *Lothaire* had received again *Thietberga* as his wife, having sent *Waldrade* to Rome, under the conduct of the papal legates, that she might perform penance there. And when, soon after this, *Thietberga* herself, under the renewed ill-treatment of her husband, applied to the pope for the annulment of the marriage, nothing but his own death prevented *Nicholas* from proceeding to the most extreme measures with the king, in maintaining the inviolability of the marriage tie. Contemporaneously with these occurrences, *Nicholas* humbled the powerful and haughty *Hincmar*, archbishop of Rheims, a zealous defender of the freedom of the French national church, who, at a synod at *Soissons*, in 803, had deposed *Rothad* bishop of *Soissons*, with whom he had often been in conflict, and who had made his appeal to the pope. *Nicholas* ordered, when the French bishops sent an account of their proceedings to him, that *Hincmar* should either immediately reinstate *Rothad*, or else send to Rome for a regular investigation, upon the ground that the

pope was the only judge in the case of differences between bishops, and that each synod could give a valid decision only under his authority, — principles which were laid down in the Pseudo-Isidorean decretals, and to which he could appeal with the more confidence inasmuch as the French bishops had already, in previous instances, cited from these decretals in their own behalf. Rothad was obliged to go to Rome, and was sent back to his bishopric, in 865, with a letter from the pope.

The successor of Nicholas, *Hadrian II.* (867–872), was not so successful in carrying out these principles of ecclesiastical polity. When, after the death of Lothaire II. in 869, Lothaire's uncle *Charles the Bald* king of France had seized his territories, which of right should have gone to Lothaire's brother the emperor Lewis II., the pope declared earnestly for the claims of Lewis, and made representations to this effect to the French bishops, his right to interfere in the case was contemptuously repelled by *Hincmar of Rheims*. He was equally unsuccessful in asserting his claims in another contest with Hincmar. At the synod of *Douzi*, in 871, Hincmar had deposed his nephew, the haughty young bishop *Hincmar of Laon*. The latter maintained, in accordance with the Pseudo-Isidorean decretals, that the pope alone could be his judge. The pope now made the same demand of Hincmar which his predecessor had made in the case of Rothad, but was again repulsed by the archbishop, in the name of king Charles, in the strongest terms. Hincmar, in particular, declared in the most decided and vehement manner against the validity of the Pseudo-Isidorean decretals, yet without entering into a close examination of them, or attacking them in a way to make a lasting impression. He did not deny their genuineness, but contended that they were not binding upon the Frankish church, because they had not been formally adopted by it.

The position of the pope became more favorable under Hadrian's successor *John VIII.* (872–882), who enjoyed the triumph of seeing king Charles the Bald willing to sacrifice all his royal prerogatives and the rights of the national

church, for which he had contended so zealously, in order to obtain the papal vote for his elevation to the imperial throne. Notwithstanding all the opposition of Hincmar and the other bishops, *Ansegisus* archbishop of Sens was appointed by the new emperor apostolical vicar and spiritual primate over the whole kingdom of France.

Very soon after the pontificate of John VIII., there succeeded a long period of deep corruption, one of the most shameful eras in the history of the Papacy, introduced by the violent conflicts of the various factions of Italian nobles. Among these parties, one in particular, at whose head stood the Margrave *Adelbert of Tuscany* together with two vicious Roman women *Theodora* and her daughter *Marozia*, acquired great influence over the election of the pope.¹ Those most worthless persons, the shameless *Sergius* III. (904–911), *John* X. (914–928), *John* XI. (931–936), and others like them, were the mere creatures of this party. *Octavianus*, a youth of eighteen years, the grandson of Marozia, who had grown up in vice, succeeded them in 956, under the name of *John* XII., and during his pontificate enormities reached their height. Female pilgrims, if they would preserve their honor, must not visit the sacred city. The papal palace was a harem.² But the pope's perfidy towards the German king *Otto* I., whom he had called into Italy, in 960, to assist him against their common enemy the Italian king *Berengar* II. and his son *Adelbert*, and whom he had crowned emperor of Germany in 962, prepared the way for his own downfall. At a synod convened by the emperor at Rome, in 963, the pope was convicted of murder, blasphemy, and all kinds of impurity, was deposed, and pope *Leo* XV. chosen in his place, whose pontifical authority, in spite of the opposition of *John*, and afterwards of *Benedict* V., was made triumphant by *Otto*. Yet tranquillity lasted only so long as *Otto* lived. Immediately after his death in 973, the Tuscan party rose

¹ Luitprandi Historia; Flodoardi († 966) Chronicon (919–960); Fragmenta de pontiff. Rom. in Mabillon Acta ss. Compare Löschner Historie des röm. Hurenregiments.

² Luitprandi De rebus imperatorum et regum VI. 6.

to power again, and exerted anew its corrupting influence upon the Romish see and its official appointments.

The next conflict into which the Papacy entered, after such a century as this, could not fail to disclose how deeply, or how superficially, its authority was lodged in the minds of men. Pope *John XV.* (985-996) was asked, in a very reverential letter, by *Hugh Capet*, who was endeavoring to establish himself in his newly acquired French throne, to decide whether the archbishop *Arnulph of Rheims*, whom Hugh had craftily made archbishop because he was a brother of Charles of Lothringia his only rival to the French throne, should not be deposed again for having traitorously opened the gates of Rheims to his enemy and rival. The pope, uncertain which of the two French parties would prove superior, delayed his decision so long that Hugh, believing that he could dispense with his assistance, and supported by the energy, learning, and boldness of *Gerbert*, who was at that time secretary of the church in Rheims, and of his like-minded friend, bishop *Arnulph of Orleans*, compelled Arnulph of Rheims, at a synod convened at Rheims in 991, to send in his resignation, and appointed Gerbert in his stead. The pope, enraged, declared the synod to be null and void, and suspended from office all the participants in it. Gerbert, terrified, in three letters encouraged the French bishops to resist the lawless authority of the pope. But the papacy, so firmly entrenched in the superstition of the time that it could not be overthrown even by its worthless incumbents, had the voice of the people with it, and even Hugh's successor, *Robert* king of Normandy (996-1031), was not inclined to carry on the hazardous contest against the head of the church. In order to induce pope Gregory V. (996-999) to legitimate his marriage with Bertha, he submitted to the retraction, at a second synod at Rheims in 996, of all that had previously been done in opposition to the pope's authority, to the deposition of Gerbert, and the restoration of Arnulph to the archbishopric. Gerbert became archbishop of Ravenna in 998, and having been at an earlier period the instructor of the em-

peror *Otto* III. was made pope through his influence, under the title of *Sylvester* II. (999–1003). But Gerbert now had no inclination to carry out his old principles. On the contrary, he labored craftily to break down the imperial power, in order to strengthen the papal; first, by nourishing in the youthful emperor the idea of founding at Rome a western empire after the model of the Byzantine, — a plan that alienated all the best of the German prelates, — and secondly, by separating the Polish and Hungarian churches from their connection with the German, and placing them under the rule of papal vicars. He was also the first pope who broached (in 999) the idea of a crusade of Christendom to recover the holy sepulchre.

Soon after *Otto*'s death in 1002, and that of *Sylvester* II. in 1003, the Italian dissensions broke out afresh, owing to the feebleness of the emperor's power in Italy. In the contest with the Tuscan party, the counts of *Tusculi* attained to so much influence, that from the time of *Benedict* VIII. (1012–1024), a scion of their house, the papal dignity for a long period became as it were hereditary in their family. *Benedict* was succeeded by his brother *John* XIX. (1024–1033), a layman; and he was succeeded in 1033 by his kinsman *Theophylact*, a boy of twelve years, who had grown up in the most shameful vice, who assumed the name of *Benedict* IX.¹ His horrible debaucheries rendered it easy for the opposing party to elect another pope, *Sylvester* III., who expelled *Benedict* from Rome; but when *Benedict* found means to return again, he shared with him the possession of the city and the papacy. *Benedict* afterwards, being in need of money, sold his share in the papacy to the archpresbyter *John Gratian*, who took the name of *Gregory* VI., an upright man who regarded the disgrace of obtaining the papacy in this manner as a necessary sacrifice in order to save the church from utter destruction. Nevertheless, *Benedict* did not relinquish his claims to the papal dignity, and

¹ The abbot *Desiderius*, afterwards pope *Victor* III., in his dialogues speaks of him as a pope "cujus quidem post adeptum sacerdotium vita quam turpis, quam foeda, quamque execranda exstiterit, horresco referre."

thus there were three popes at one and the same time. In order to put an end to this confusion, the emperor *Henry III.* marched an army to Rome, in 1046. The *synod of Sutri*, assembled at his command in 1046, deposed all three popes, and elected in their place bishop *Suidger* of Bamberg, a sincere and devout German ecclesiastic belonging to the emperor's retinue, under the title of *Clement II.* Through the influence of the emperor, and in spite of an attempt of *Benedict IX.* to usurp the papacy once more, bishop *Poppo* of *Brixen* was elected pope in 1048, under the title of *Damasus II.*, in the place of *Clement*, who died in 1047; and when in the same year *Damasus* himself died, the same imperial influence placed in the papal chair bishop *Bruno* of *Toul*, who took the title of *Leo IX.*, with whose pontificate a new and important section of the history of the Papacy begins.

From the year 1048 and onward, the Papacy was shaped more and more by the influence of a man who made and marked the greatest of its epochs, and imparted to it its complete historical form. This man is *Hildebrand*.¹ He was the son of a smith of *Saone*, and had early joined the Benedictine monks, first at *Rome* and afterwards at *Clugny*. A friend of *Gregory VI.*, whose earnest attempts to reform the church he knew and sympathized with, he did not desert him in his misfortunes, but shared his exile with him. While upon a journey through *France*, pope *Leo IX.* (1048–1053) became acquainted with him, and gave him the appointment of sub-deacon in the church at *Rome*; and following the advice of *Hildebrand*, the pope himself, who had been put into office by the emperor, who was a layman, journeyed as a pilgrim to *Rome*, in order there to be regularly invested with office. Under *Leo*, as well as under his successors, *Victor II.* (1055–1057) whom *Hildebrand* had been instrumental in placing in the papal chair, and *Stephen IX.* (1057–58), the influence of *Hildebrand* steadily rose.

¹ *Bonizo* († 1089) *De persecutione eccl. libb. IX.*; *Desiderius* (*Victor III.*) *De miraculis S. Benedicti*; *Leo Ostiensis* (A. D. 1101) *Chron. monasterii Casinens*; *Voigt Hildebrand, und sein Zeitalter.*

From him, undoubtedly, proceeded the plan in accordance with which these three popes acted, and which was adopted by many synods in and out of Italy, — the plan, namely, of repressing simony and the immorality of the clergy, by forbidding the investiture of the bishops by imperial authority, and by a stricter enforcement of the rules enjoining celibacy. By this method Hildebrand sought to check the rising domination of the empire over the church, and also to put a stop to the flood of licentiousness that was coming in upon the clergy; while at the same time he would render the clerical order a more energetic and subservient body by disconnecting them entirely from social and family life.

Two parties now stood confronted with each other, in Italy, — the party of Hildebrand, rendered yet more zealous by Hildebrand's ardent admirer *Peter Damiani*, the rigorously ascetic bishop of Ostio¹ (†1072), and that of the secular and ecclesiastical nobility, to whom the existing immorality and disorder was more agreeable than the hierarchical severity and moral correctness of Hildebrand.

After the death of Stephen, in 1058, the opponents of Hildebrand succeeded, during his absence from Rome, in electing a pope of their own; namely, John, bishop of Veletri, who took the title of *Benedict X.* But Hildebrand, on his return, succeeded by his ability and adroitness in nullifying this election, and securing the appointment of Gerhard bishop of Florence, under the name of *Nicholas II.* (1058-1061), to whom Benedict, though at first resisting, soon submitted. In order to withdraw the papal election, in future, from the disturbing influences of the civil power, Nicholas transferred it, at the Lateran council in 1059, to a *College of Cardinals*,² enacting that the pope should always be

¹ Damiani, however, not seldom followed the measures of Hildebrand contrary to his own judgment; and he was wont jocosely to call him his St. Satan (Epp. I. 16).

² According to the Latin of the sixth century, *cardinales clerici* denoted clergymen who occupied a post permanently, and not merely provisionally (*incardinati*). Hence *cardinalis* in ecclesiastical Latin signifies the same as *præcipuus*. At a later date, when the Roman see came to be the *cardo* of the church, the priests connected with the church of the city of Rome were particularly denom-

chosen at Rome, and that he should be one of the cardinal bishops, elected to the office with the concurrence of the cardinal clergy (bishops, presbyters, and deacons), and also with the assent of the rest of the Roman clergy, and of the Roman people. And in case of political disorders at Rome preventing, the election might be made at any other suitable place by the cardinal bishops, with the coöperation of certain of the clergy and laity chosen for the purpose. But notwithstanding this enactment, new disturbances arose, owing to the conflict of parties, after the death of Nicholas in 1061. Hildebrand's opponents allied themselves by an embassy with the imperial court, and an embassy which Hildebrand then sent to the emperor was denied a hearing. Hildebrand then, without any further reference to the imperial authority, proceeded to the election of a pope. Alexander, archbishop of Lucca, was chosen, under the title of *Alexander II.* (1061–1073), and was so effectually supported by the energy and power of Hildebrand that his rival Honorius II. (Cadalous bishop of Parma), who had been elected by the imperial party at a council at Basle, was rejected by the synod of Osborn in 1062, and of Mantua in 1064, and was in a few years compelled to yield the contest. Under more favorable political circumstances,¹ Alexander was at length acknowledged as pope by the emperor, and Hildebrand as archdeacon and chancellor of the church at Rome had full opportunity to prepare the way for his own ascent to the

inated cardinales presbyteri, and the overseers of hospitals of the city, cardinales diaconi; and in the eleventh century the seven suburban bishops who presided over the pope's special diocese, and who performed service in order at the cathedral church in Rome, were denominated cardinales episcopi. *Buddeus* De origine cardinalitiae dignitatis.

¹ *English* influences contributed to strengthen pope Alexander; for by the advice of Hildebrand, who was himself influenced by Lanfranc, *William of Normandy* was authorized to deliver England from the rule of the semi-pagan Anglo-Saxons and *Harold*, the last of the Anglo-Saxon kings, was placed under the papal ban, and fell in the murderous battle at Hastings in 1066. This policy associated England with the Papacy, but at the same time left in the mind of the Anglo-Saxon population a latent hatred of it, which at a later period showed itself.

papal throne.¹ The young emperor *Henry IV.*, having been restrained in his lusts by a papal decision, and then complained of at Rome by the Saxons for disgraceful simony and oppression of his subjects, had just been summoned before the pope to answer the charge, and was burning with the desire of revenge, when Alexander died.

§ 116.

CHURCH AND STATE.

With the ascent of Hildebrand to the papal chair, the relations between the church and the state underwent an essential change. Hitherto the state had exerted a highly important influence upon the church, while the influence of the church upon the state had been increasingly uncertain, fluctuating, and sometimes equivocal.

The *influence of the state upon the church* was apparent particularly in the *position and relations of the bishops*. These were frequently, and not seldom to the injury of the church, nominated according to the caprice of princes and nobles, and, as the feudal system became more consolidated, they came to be regarded and treated as an order of vassals (*ministeriales*), owing service to, and being entirely dependent upon, the princes and their feudal lords (*domini*). Many, however, took offence at this vassal relation of the bishop, upon the ground that the episcopal character ought to release him from the obligation to take the layman's oath of dependence and fealty (*hominii, fidelitatis*) ; and still more, because the symbol of investiture, — the gift of a ring and a staff (*investitura per baculum et annulum*), — was borrowed not from the earthly but the spiritual province, and

¹ In reference to the influence of Hildebrand over the popes, Damiani addressed him in these lines :

Papam rite colo, sed Te prostratus adoro ;
Tu facis hunc Dominum, Te facit iste Deum.

when, therefore, these were delivered over to a bishop by a secular prince, it looked as if the church were deriving its sacred authority from a merely secular source. Furthermore, the vassal relation of the bishop to a feudal lord was for many a temptation to secularize their spiritual calling by engaging in war, and in other ways; while at the same time some few, — as for example *Ulrich* bishop of Augsburg, and *Bernward* bishop of Hildesheim, — embraced the opportunity to modify the civil and secular institutions with which they were thus connected by this feudal relation, by the spirit of Christianity, and by means of Christian science and art.

The *influence of the church upon the state* showed itself principally in the *administration of justice*. To counteract the then universally prevailing club-law and the almost daily combats, the bishops and abbots of France, in 1032, took occasion during a time of rejoicing following a season of great scarcity to appoint each Friday, the day of Christ's Passion, as a day of fasting and penitence, when every injury should be forgiven, and all contests, whether of war or legal proceedings, should cease. From this ordinance sprang soon afterwards, — by the decision of the synod of Limoges, which was adopted in Aquitania in 1041, and afterwards in the neighboring districts, — the so-called *truce of God* (Trevia or Treuga Dei); the observance, namely, of the time from Wednesday evening till Monday morning, as a period of fasting; during which no one should be arraigned before a tribunal, and no one should use violence towards another. The observance of this time was carefully watched over and maintained by the church.

The influence of the church upon the administration of justice was also seen in the so-called *Ordeals*¹ (ordalia,

¹ They consisted of the duel (between two persons who had taken an oath in contradiction to each other); the ordeal by boiling water or by fire (in which to be burnt was a proof of guilt); and the ordeal by cold water (in which to float was a proof of innocence). The clergy were obliged to submit to these latter trials in case of a charge that they had misused the Sacrament. Compare Majer Geschichte der Ordalien; Phillips Die Ordalien bei den Germanen; Röttberg Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands Bd. II. S. 749 19.

judicia Dei), — an institution of which traces are to be discovered not only among the old German populations, but also among the Hindoos, Chinese, Japanese, and even among the Greeks. It has its foundation in the belief that there is such a sympathy between the forces of nature and the moral law written in the conscience, that no criminal can escape the Divine judgments here in time, even in case he has succeeded in escaping those of a human tribunal. This belief was cherished in an extreme and superstitious form, and was connected with usages that were heathen, and contrary to the prohibition to tempt God to the manifestation of miraculous powers. The influence of the church was at first exerted to give a somewhat less superstitious cast to the institution. The council of *Valence*, in 855, punished with excommunication those who should seek a decision by duel, and refused Christian burial to him who should fall therein, as to a suicide; archbishop *Agobard* of Lyons († 841) wrote several treatises against the ordeal, (*Contra judicium Dei*, and others), and argued in favor of a regular judicial investigation; pope *Nicholas* I. declared the ordeal, by which method king *Lothaire* II. wished to decide his case (§ 115), to be a tempting of God; and pope *Stephen* VI. (885–891), in a letter to *Leutbert* archbishop of *Mayence*, declared against the ordeal. But these individual voices could not prevail against the spirit of the age, to which even the emperor *Charlemagne* was himself obliged to yield (in the *Capitularies* of the year 794, 803, and particularly 809),¹ and the church more and more took the trial by ordeal under its protection, and deepened the popular superstition respecting it.

¹ “Ut omnes judicio Dei credant absque dubitatione.” *Baluzii Capitular.* T. I. 466.

§ 117.

take

THE CLERGY AND MONASTICISM.

The corruption of the clergy steadily rose to a higher pitch during this period. While many evils of the preceding period like that of the vagrant clergy (§ 100); the appointment of an order of secular priests, who were for the most part chosen from the vagrant clergy or else from feudal vassals, and who submitted to be used for the lowest purposes; the practise of many things that degraded the clerical office (such as hunting, gaming, drinking, etc.), and transformed its functions into a mere mechanical routine, — while all these continued to exist and increase, the benefits accruing in the previous period from the reformation of the clergy commenced by the canonicate rule of Chrodegang (§ 100) steadily decreased in this. Many of the heads of the canonical houses made use of their position to render themselves independent of the bishops, and this position of independency was more and more assured to them by statute, by their hope of being elected to a bishopric, as well as by stipulations. More than this, they gradually threw off one canonical rule after another, withdrew more and more from the performance of canonical duties, and thought only of enjoying the canonical revenues in their prebends and benefices. As a consequence, these revenues became merely a lure for a class of clergymen who had nothing to recommend them but their noble birth. In vain did upright and pious bishops, — stern censors of morals like, *Damiani*¹ (§ 114), and *Ratherius*,² bishop of Verona

¹ In his work, entitled *Gomorrhianus*, and in his Letters, he has unveiled and lashed the debaucheries of the clergy. See his biography by his pupil *Johannes Monachus* in his Opera, and in *Acta Sanctorum*, Feb. T. III. p. 406. Compare also *Laderchii Vita S. Damiani*.

² *Ratherius* was an intellectual and original man, who spent the greater portion of his long life amidst conflicts and sufferings of various kinds, and whose violence sometimes neutralized the effects of his zeal and better judgment. To mention a specimen of his age, — he was obliged to entreat his clergy not to

(† 974), — attempt to stem the rising tide of clerical corruption.

Monasticism began now to lose its previously high character. The wealth of the monasteries gradually introduced corruption among the monks; laymen crowded themselves into the abbot's office merely for the sake of the emoluments, so that in France most of the abbeys in the ninth century were under the rule of lay-abbots; and not seldom the consecrated walls resounded with the voices of women, children, soldiers, and the barking of the huntsman's hounds. A thorough reform of the whole monastic system became an urgent necessity. The excellent abbot *Benedict of Aniane* in Languedoc († 821) accomplished a reformation, first in his own monastery, and afterwards in a number of French monasteries that were devolved upon him, for this purpose, by the emperor *Lewis the Pious*. He introduced a stricter system of monastic regulations, employing as the instrument of discipline manual labor and intellectual cultivation, and, in general, revising the old Benedictine rule (§ 74). But his attempts did not result in a general reformation throughout the church; although the synod of *Aix la Chapelle*, in 817, adopted his regulations, and made them authoritative for the Frankish empire, and his influence, particularly through the union of several monasteries under one head (*congregatio monachorum*) prepared the way for a sounder monastic constitution.

Benedict's example was followed, at a later day, by the abbot *Berno*,¹ by birth a Burgundian count († 927), who, having been deeply stirred by the unbridled license of the monastic life in which he had been brought up, introduced a stricter regimen into a number of monasteries under his

appear before the altar intoxicated, with swords and spurs. His works are contained in D'Achery *Spicilegium* T. I. II.; and still more complete in *Ratherii Opera* ed. fratres Ballerini. Compare *Histoire littéraire de la France*, T. VI.; Engelhardt *uber Ratherius von Verona*; Neander *Leben des Ratherius*, in *Deutschen Zeitschrift* 1851.

¹ See the *Vitae* of *Berno* and his successors, written by his pupils, in *Maillon Acta Sanctorum*, Sec. V. VI.

charge. His energetic successor *Odo* († 942) exerted a still more important influence in the same direction. The impressions of a severe sickness had turned him away from a life at court to the clerical profession, and having studied the Benedictine rule while a canonical priest at Tours, and being shocked at the contrast between its requirements and the actual monastic life about him, he left, and placed himself under *Berno's* instruction, who, at his death, bequeathed to him the care of most of the monasteries he had established or reformed. Under his administration, the monastery of *Clugny* in Burgundy, which had been founded in 910 by *Berno* at the suggestion of William duke of Aquitania, acquired high renown, and became the head and model of all the other monasteries¹ of the *Congregation of Clugny* in the Benedictine order.² The congregation soon became a religious power in France, was distinguished for the excessive strictness of its asceticism, and, by its zealous and successful labors in the education of youth, and afterwards in science and art, contributed greatly towards the physical and spiritual well-being of the French populations. Its influence was also greatly enhanced by the high personal character of its first abbots, — viz., after *Berno* and the revered *Odo*, *Aymar* till 948, *Majolus* till 994, *Odilo* till 1048, and *Hugo* the friend of *Hildebrand*. The acting abbot of *Clugny* was the head of the whole *Congregation*, was chosen by the monks there, and from thence sent out priors to the other monasteries, who, in an annual convocation at *Clugny*, attended to the supervision and legislation of the whole body.

The idea of such monastic congregations, or, in the narrower sense, of monastic orders, accorded with the spirit of the time, and hence similar associations to that of *Clugny* arose also in Italy and Germany during this period. In

¹ In the middle of the twelfth century they numbered two thousand, and were mostly in France.

² *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis, in qua Sanctorum Patrum Abbatum vitæ, miracula, scripta rec.*

1018, *Romuald*,¹ of the race of the dukes of Ravenna (died 1027, aged 120), founded a congregation of eremites at Camaldoli in a district of the Appenines, which afterwards became the *Order of Camaldulesians*; and *John Gualbert*,² († 1093) established the coenobite order of *Vallambrosans* at Vallambrosa. The vow of renunciation adopted by both of these orders, extended even to the enjoyment of the religious life, and to social conversation. In Germany, the abbot *William of Hirsau* (§ 109) founded the *congregation of Hirsau* after the model of Clugny.

There are, moreover, individual monks in this period, outside of the great monastic associations, who remind us of the virtues of the monks of an earlier time. An illustrious example of this kind is *Nilus*, surnamed the younger, born of Grecian parents at Rosano in Calabria, the founder of several monasteries in Italy, who exhibited in the midst of the corruption of the Italian church in the tenth century the model of a life wholly consecrated to Christian benevolence, the instrument of many conversions, and an uncompromising rebuker of wickedness in high places, as his dealing with the emperor Otto III. shows. He died in 1005, having departed to a retired convent, in order to prevent the canonization of his bones.³ The same spirit animated his pupil, the abbot *Bartholomew*.

¹ Vita by Damiani in Mabillon *Acta Sanctorum*, Saec. IV. Pars. I. p. 247.

² Vita in Mabillon *Acta Sanct.* Saec. IV. p. 273.

³ See the very interesting sketch of him by Neander III. 420—424, drawn from a biography in the *Acta Sanctorum*,

SECTION THIRD.

Christian Life and Worship.

§ 118.

CHRISTIAN LIFE.

THE masses of Christendom from the ninth to the eleventh century are still less penetrated than previously by the true spirit of Christianity. The religious life of the rude populations of this age could not prosper, because they were *wholly destitute of Christian instruction*. The knowledge of divine truth was debarred them, because they neither possessed the written word, nor heard the preached word. The Scriptures were not accessible in the vernacular tongue, and there was not a sufficient number of clergymen sufficiently educated to read and explain it to the people. Even so slender requisitions as were made upon their clergy by the more zealous and faithful bishops, like *Hincmar* of Rheims, and *Ratherius* of Verona,—namely, that they should be able to preach upon the Apostle's Creed and the Lord's Prayer, should be able to repeat the mass-prayers, and to read the Epistles of Paul and the Gospels,—failed to be met in many instances, partly because, as *Riculf* bishop of Soisson testified, in a pastoral letter about the year 900, the clergy did not possess an entire copy of the Scriptures. Requirements like that of bishop *Herard* of Tours in 858, that discourses should be delivered upon all the principal events of the four Gospels; like that of the synod of *Mayence* in 848, that each bishop should preach in a plain manner in the vernacular language, upon faith, retribution, the

resurrection, the day of judgment, and good works ; like that of the synod of *Valence*, in 855, that no bishop should forego the opportunity of giving instruction and warning in a sermon ; and like that of the synod of *Langres* and *Savonnieres* in 859, that schools should be established for the study of the Bible, — requirements like these failed of general compliance. It was natural, consequently, that the people, while supposing themselves to be Christians, sank deeper in superstition. And this was aggravated by the use made of *ecclesiastical penances*, which we have seen began to be employed in the preceding period (§ 102), but which were now withdrawn more and more from the control of the bishops, and assumed an extreme and demoralizing form under the steadily growing power of the papacy. At first, each bishop had the supervision of the whole system of penance within his own diocese ; but now, the popes, encouraged to such a course by the fact that many persons came to Rome upon matters of penance, — having been sent upon a pilgrimage thither by their bishops ; or else because the bishop desired the opinion of the pope in some one difficult instance, — assumed the right of an arbitrary and unlimited interference with the system of penance within the episcopal dioceses, and even of giving papal absolution to vicious persons upon whom the bishops had imposed penance for their sins. Protests of individual bishops and of episcopal convocations (like that of the council of *Seligenstadt*, in 1022, under the presidency of *Aribo* bishop of Mayence, which decreed that any absolution, issuing from Rome in contravention of penance inflicted by regular ecclesiastical authority, should be null and void) against this new and illegitimate claim of the popes, were all in vain. The influence of the popes upon the system of penance, finally reached its height in the *anathema* or *ban*, which, by a decree of the council of *Pavia* in 950, was declared to be a higher species of excommunication, and in the *interdict*, by which an entire region was excommunicated. This latter was often employed to humble such turbulent nobles as had refused to yield to the anathema, and was put in execution

first by a provincial synod in 1031, against some predatory French barons. The anathema excluded an individual from the church and from Christian society ; while the interdiction extended to a whole province. During its continuance no person, excepting a clergyman, a beggar, a child not above two years old, and a stranger, could receive ecclesiastical burial ; divine service must be performed in private ; baptism must be imparted only when asked for, and the communion be given only to the dying ; and no marriages could be performed.

§ 119.

CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

As in morals, so in worship, superstition constantly increased, and showed itself particularly in the *worship of saints*, the *worship of relics*, and the *worship of images*. The *worship of saints*, favored and authorized as it was by the rising influence of the papacy, now threatened to entirely supersede that of God. Hitherto, each individual diocese had had the right to select those whose memory after their death it would have commemorated, thereby preparing the way for the veneration of a particular saint to pass over into the universal church ; but in this period pope John XV., in 993, declared that the deservedly revered bishop *Ulric* of Augsburg,¹ who had been dead for twenty years, should be regarded a saint by the whole church. This was the first instance of papal canonization, and did not long continue to be the only one. The superstition of the age showed itself in perhaps its greatest extreme in the *worship of relics*. Great deception was practised in palming off the bones of dead men as relics capable of working miracles ; and in one instance, in France, the design was actually entertained of putting a devout person to death, in order to

¹ Mabillon Acta Sanctorum, Saec. V.

have the corpse of a saint for a protection. The French church resisted for a while the superstitious worship of images which was favored by the Roman church and by the church generally, but after the tenth and eleventh centuries it yielded to the current. The second stage in the *Image Controversy* fell into the first part of this period, in which a renewed attack upon the image worship of the Greek church, continuing until 842, was completely repulsed (See § 109). In this attack the French church took the lead, and continued to manifest its opposition, at least in a passive manner, during the whole of the ninth century. But afterward, owing to the paralyzing influence of the spirit of the times, it grew weaker and weaker in the struggle, until it lost all its strength, and all its inclination to wage the conflict,—the pope in the meanwhile, by a very adroit management quietly enduring the heterodoxy of the French iconoclasts, but bitterly opposing that of the Greek iconoclasts.

But while the worship of the church during this period grew corrupt as a whole, there was improvement in one particular,—that, namely, of *church music*. Soon after the death of Charlemagne, the Gregorian cantus firmus did indeed begin to deteriorate, and capricious changes and ornaments were introduced by the singers. But one consequence of this was, that gradually a discantus, or cantus figuratus, sprang up by the side of the cantus firmus, and the chant for one voice became one for two voices. Specific rules respecting harmony began to be formed, particularly by *Hucbald*, a monk of Rheims, about the year 900, by *Reginus*, a German monk, about the year 920, and by *Odo* the abbot of Clugny. In the place of the singular Gregorian score, *Guido of Arezzo* (1000–1050), a Benedictine monk of Tuscany, invented the present method of writing the scale, which, by means of the so-called counterpoint (*punctum contra punctum*), added the discantus to the cantus. The *organ*, also, soon after the time of Charlemagne, came into more and more general use, notwithstanding its imperfection,—having at first only twelve keys, which were struck with the fist.

There was improvement, also, in the *Hymnology*.¹ The old hymns alone were no longer sufficient; and some new compositions of distinguished merit appeared, such for example, as the “*Cantemus Domino*” of *Rabanus Maurus*, the “*Lumen inclytum refulget*” of *Walafried Strabo*. *Balbulus*, a monk of St. Gall († 912), added the so-called *sequenza*, — a choral song, at first without rhythm, but soon a metrical composition, — to the so-called *jubilis*, or music without words, of the mass. His example was followed by *Robert of France*, Hugh Capet’s son († 1031), in his “*Veni Sancte Spiritus, et emitte coelitus*,”² and *Veni Sancte Spiritus, Reple tuorum corda fidelium*,” also by Peter Damiani († 1072), and the unknown author of the “*Media vita in morte sumus*, etc.” About this same time, the people began to take some part in the lyrical services of the church. At first, their participation was confined to the singing, or crying, of the *Kyrie eleison*, or *Christe eleison* in the Latin choral service; but in Germany, the *Kyrie eleison* soon began to be enlarged and enriched by fitting words in the native language, — the so-called *Laisen* or *Lais* (*eleison*), a name which passed over to all sacred songs composed in the vernacular.

¹ See Koch *Geschichte des Kirchenliedes*; Hoffman von Fallersleben *Geschichte des Kirchenliedes bis auf Luther*; Heydler *Ueber das Wesen und die Anfänge der christlichen Kirchenlieder*; Daniel *Thesaurus Hymnologicus*.

² *Veni Sancte Spiritus, et emitte coelitus lucis tue radium*
Veni pater pauperum, Veni dator munerum, Veni lumen cordium.
Consolator optime, Dulcis hospes animae, Dulce refrigerium,
In labore requies, In aestu temperies, In fletu solatium!
O lux beatissima, Reple cordis intima, Tuorum fidelium!
Sine tuo nomine, Nihil est in homine, Nihil est innoxium.
Flecte quod est rigidum, Fove quod est frigidum, Rege quod est devium!
Lava quod est sordidum, Riga quod est aridum, Sana quod est saucium!
Da tuis fidelibus, In te confidentibus, Sacrum septennarium!
Da virtutis meritum, Da salutis exitum, Da perenne gaudium! Amen.

§ 120.

OPPOSITION TO SUPERSTITION.

A few enlightened and courageous men, chiefly of the French church, and during the time of the second section of the image controversy, raised their voices against the prevailing superstition in life and worship. One of them was *Agobard*, archbishop of Lyons († 841), who in a special treatise combated the superstitious use of pictures and images, and vehemently opposed the worship of saints. He also greatly improved the Psalmody of his church, by a revision of the liturgy, which had become greatly corrupted. In this work he proceeded upon the principle of introducing into the liturgy, as far as possible, only biblical expressions and phraseology. He earnestly objected to an artificial style of church music, which, he said, belonged rather to the theatre, and blames those clergymen who, in their devotion to the subject of sacred music, neglect the study of the Scriptures.¹ Another of these reformers was *Jonas* the venerated bishop of Orleans († 843), who has left a work, *De cultu imaginum*, and another, *De institutione laicali*, in which he inveighs against a dead, fruitless faith, and places the essence of true penitence in the crushing of the *heart* and confession *before God*. Nearly a century later, *Ratherius*, bishop of Verona, urged so strict a virtue, that his clergy complained that he made the way to heaven too difficult for any mortal to walk in.

The most distinguished of these reformers was *Claudius* bishop of Turin († about 840), a learned Spaniard who had been educated by the diligent study of the Bible and of St. Augustine, — a man of glowing zeal and genuine reformatory illumination, but somewhat inclined to a hyper-spiritualism that sometimes carried him beyond the golden mean.² Invited to his court by Louis the Pious, he was

¹ Opera Agobardi. Ed Baluzii. Compare Hundeshagen De Agobardi vita et scriptis.

² Claudius was charged by his opponent with being a disciple of Felix of Urgel-

then sent by the king to Turin, in Italy, the principal seat of superstition, where he proceeded earnestly, and sometimes in a manner that was not always wise, against the use of images, and insisted upon their entire and immediate banishment from the church. He also opposed the use of the sign of the cross, asserting that it owed its origin to an unwillingness to bear the cross after Christ; and the worship of saints, saying that nothing but the imitation of the saints in faith and life could be of benefit. His views were combated by *Dungal*, a monk probably from Scotland or Ireland, and also by his old friend *Theodemir* abbot of Nismes; and when the pope, *Paschalis* I. (817–824), gave his voice against him, he disputed the papal authority. During his continual contests and manifold persecutions, Claudius was strongly sustained by the inward peace and joy that flowed from his faith in Christ's justifying righteousness, and as he was under the emperor's protection, the pope dared not make any attempts upon his person. Yet Louis by no means agreed with the views of Claudius upon the controverted points, and devolved upon *Jonas*, bishop of Orleans, the task of refuting them. Jonas published soon after the death of Claudius in 840, his work *De cultu imaginum*, in which he reaffirmed the old mid-way principles of the *Libri Carolini* (§ 109) respecting the use of images.¹ About the same time, *Walafried Strabo*, abbot of Reichenau († 849), maintained the same Carolinian views in his liturgical work, *De exordiis et incrementis rerum ecclesiasticarum*, in which he expressed the opinion that one might as well abolish church edifices and everything else of a visible nature, upon the ground that they might be abused for purposes of superstition, as to utterly abolish images for the same reason. This was the last clear defence of the Carolinian principles in the French church.

lis, who maintained the Adoptian theory. But there is no trace of Adoptianism in his commentaries upon the Scriptures, of which considerable is extant. See *Bibliotheca Patrum* Lugd. T. XIV.; *Rudelbach Claudii Taurin. ineditorum operum specimina*.

¹ The writings of Jonas, Theodemir, and Dungal against Claudius are contained in *Biblioth. Patr. Lugd. T. XIV.*

SECTION FOURTH.

History of Doctrine.

CHAPTER FIRST.

take

THEOLOGY AND CONTROVERSIES.

§ 121.

SEPARATION OF THE EASTERN FROM THE WESTERN CHURCH.

Walch *Historia controversiae Graecorum Latinorumque de processione Spiritus Sancti*. Neander *Church History* III. 558-586. Maimbourg *Histoire du schisme des Grecs*. Leo Allatius *De ecclesiae occidentalis et orientalis perpetua consensione*. For the original documents see Canisius *Lectiones antiquae* III. 271 sq., and Cotelierius *Ecclesiae Graecae monumenta* II.

THE separation of the Eastern from the Western church was an event of great importance in respect to the development of dogmatic theology. The grounds of the differences between the two churches were partly natural, and partly ecclesiastical. The Greek was excitable and changeable; the Roman was characterized by firmness and steadiness. The former was inclined to speculation; the latter was practical in his tendency. The Greek cultivated speculative dogmatics; the Roman became more and more interested in the sacramental aspects of the church. In the West there was sufficient freedom to secure a healthy growth, until the formation of the papal despotism; in the East the church was manacled by the imperial power.

These differences between the two great divisions of Christendom did not, however, result in a schism, until they were heightened and aggravated by other causes. *Dogmatic* disagreement first exerted its influence. After the fourth century, the *doctrine of the Holy Spirit* assumed a different speculative form in the East from what it did in the West. The oecumenical council of Constantinople, in 381, had decided, in opposition to the Macedonian theory that the Holy Spirit is the creature of the Father through the Son, that the third person as well as the second is consubstantial with the first, and is of equal dignity with the second (Ancient Church § 85). The council did not, however, decide whether the procession of the Spirit is from the Father only, or from both the Father and Son. In respect to this question, the Western church, from the desire to maintain the complete equality between the Father and Son, under the influence of the Trinitarian speculations of Augustine inclined more and more to the position that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father *and* Son; and when the Spanish church had occasion to receive into its communion the converted Arian Gothic king *Reccared* (Ancient Church § 68), it added the clause *filioque* to the Constantinople symbol, by the decision of the *Council of Toledo* in 589. The Eastern church from the first viewed this addition to a venerable oecumenical symbol with suspicion, and as the action of the council of Toledo had been re-affirmed at *Gentilly* in 767, at *Friaul* in 796, and at *Aix la Chapelle* under the authority of Charlemagne in 809 (See § 110), the opening of this period found this particular dogmatic ground of divergence between the East and the West fully established. Again, there were differences between the Greek and the Latin church which had respect to *ecclesiastical ordinances and laws*. The Western church accepted only fifty Apostolical Canons; the Eastern accepted eighty-five (Ancient Church § 57). The latter permitted all clergymen, excepting bishops, to live in the marriage connection, in case they were already married when ordained; the former prohibited this. The Greek maintained, and the Latin denied, that the patriarch

of Constantinople was equal in rank with the bishop of Rome,—a point which gradually eclipsed all others, in practical importance, as the power of the papacy advanced. The Western church allowed, and the Eastern forbade, fasting upon Saturday, the eating of blood and things strangled, and the use of the figure of a lamb to represent Christ. These differences were distinctly enunciated and established by the Greek church, at the *Second Trullan Council* in 692 (§ 106). In this manner, the way to an open conflict between the two sections of Christendom was abundantly prepared. Yet these differences did not work out their final consequences, in a public and formal schism between the East and the West, until the middle of the ninth century.

The venerable patriarch *Ignatius* of Constantinople, in the middle of the ninth century, felt compelled to set himself in opposition to the vice and godlessness of the court, which was under the influence of the corrupt *Bardas*, the uncle, and guardian during his minority, of *Michael III*. He denied the sacrament to Bardas, and refused to be his servile instrument, and was therefore deposed and banished in 858. The most learned, and perhaps the most vain man in the Greek church, *Photius*,¹ the captain of the emperor's body guard and his private secretary, was made patriarch in his stead. But nothing could induce Ignatius to yield his conviction that his rights had been violated, or to acquiesce in the procedure. In order to overcome the party of Ignatius, and at the same time to escape the odium of the horrid barbarities of Bardas (who scourged, imprisoned,

¹ The most important work of Photius is his *Bibliotheca*,—a collection of extracts from two hundred and eighty works, most of which are not extant, with accounts of them; edited by Hoeschelius, 1601, and by Bekker, 1824. Besides this, he has left a manual of ecclesiastical law, *Νομοκανών*, in two parts,—the first part (edited by Beveridge) relating to the synodal canons, and the second (in Justelli Biblioth.) to church statutes passed by the government. Photius also composed *Adversus Paulinistas* sc. recentiores *Manichæos* libb. IV., several theological tracts, two hundred and fifty-three letters, unpublished commentaries upon Paul's Epistles, and a Greek lexicon of great value in Greek philology, edited by Hermann 1808, and Porson, 1823.

and mutilated the adherents of Ignatius), and the blasphemies of the emperor (who caused his favorites to play, in buffoonery, the parts of patriarchs and bishops), Photius convened a synod at Constantinople, in 859, which passed sentence of deposition upon the absent Ignatius. Ignatius refused to abdicate, or in any way to recognize the authority of the synod; whereupon Photius appealed to pope *Nicholas* I. for assistance in accomplishing his design. Unbiassed by the honor which Photius and the emperor had showed him by this appeal, the pope sent two bishops, as his legates, to Constantinople to make further inquiry, and bring back a report. The two legates, without obeying their instructions, were induced to take part in a *Council at Constantinople*, in 861, which was as subservient as the preceding one to the emperor's will, and re-affirmed the deposition of Ignatius (who was present and was treated with shameful disrespect), and the appointment of Photius. Nevertheless, Nicholas soon learned the true state of the case, and at a synod at Rome, in 863, excommunicated his two legates, deposed Photius, excommunicated him in case he would not abdicate, and declared Ignatius to be the patriarch of Constantinople. The angry correspondence which now passed, first between Ignatius and the emperor, and then between him and Photius, was made still more angry by a new question that arose respecting ecclesiastical authority over the Bulgarians (See § 113), which each church sought to gain. The feeling rose so high that, at a *Council at Constantinople*, in 867, to which he had invited the Eastern bishops in an encyclical letter violently denunciatory of Rome (Photii Ep. 2), Photius deposed and excommunicated the pope. In this letter, he charges upon the Roman church the heresies of fasting upon Saturday, of corrupting the great fasts, of despising confirmation from the hands of a presbyter, of forbidding regular clerical marriage, and particularly of falsifying the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan symbol in respect to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, — which latter he denominated the sin against the Holy Ghost. Nicholas regarded this attack of Photius

upon himself as an attack upon the whole Latin church, and thus the contest between the two highest ecclesiastics became one between the two sections of Christendom. Nicholas called upon the principal bishops to defend their church against the attacks of the Greeks, and thus the separating wall was built up between them.¹ The condition of affairs, nevertheless, seemed to change materially, when the emperor *Basil the Macedonian*, — the murderer of Michael, to whom, it is said, Photius refused the communion, — in 867, declared in favor of Ignatius, and sent to pope *Hadrian II.* for a new decision. A synod at Rome in 868 declared the proceedings of the last Constantinopolitan synod to be null and void, deposed Photius, and reinstated Ignatius; and a new *Synod at Constantinople*, in 869 (which the Latin church regards as the *eighth oecumenical*), publicly ratified these decisions. But soon after this, the Bulgarian controversy broke out anew between the two churches, in the heat of which Ignatius died (in 878), and Photius, who during his adversity had shown more discretion than during his prosperity, and had even lived in friendly relations with Ignatius, was appointed patriarch again. Pope *John VIII.* now perceived that a controversy with Photius would be productive of no advantage; and Photius, on the other hand, made wise by his experience, perceived how important a connection with the Roman church would be to him, in his contest with his rivals. This he sought, and the pope actually declared himself ready, notwithstanding the course which his papal predecessors had pursued, to absolve Photius from all spiritual penalties, and to acknowledge him as patriarch, provided he would ask forgiveness of the Roman church, and would renounce all claims of authority over the Bulgarians. The papal legates came to Constantinople, in 879, to arrange the whole matter. But Photius, at the new *Council at Constantinople*, in 879 and 880 (which the Greek

¹ The controversial tracts on the Latin side are contained in *Aeneae episcopi Parisiensis lib. adv. Graecos*; and in the more important works of *Ratramnus* (See § 122) *Contra Graecorum opposita, Romanam ecclesiam infamantium libb. IV.*

Church, excepting the rival party opposed to Photius, recognize as the *eighth oecumenical*), appeared by no means ready to concede so much to the pope. Without any further explanations, he assumed the position of a legitimate patriarch of Constantinople, allowed the letter of the pope to be read to the council in a mutilated and weakened version, and amused the papal legates with courtly attentions. For a while the pope still expected that Photius would yield; but he waited in vain, and at length pronounced an anathema upon him, and upon all who should acknowledge him as patriarch. Even the new deposition of Photius by the emperor *Leo the Philosopher*, in 886, did not lead to a restoration of friendly relations with Rome, although the rival party to Photius lent all their endeavors to this end; and even after the death of Photius (in exile in 891), the contest between the two churches continued.

The tenth century, witnessed a comparative forgetfulness of the strife, though no restoration of a friendly union between the East and the West; but in the eleventh century, the contest broke out again with new violence, and for ever burst the bands of communion between the Greek and Latin churches. The patriarch of Constantinople, *Michael Cerularius*, a violent enemy of the Latins, caused all their churches and cloisters at Constantinople to be closed, and, in 1053, in conjunction with Leo of Achrida, the metropolitan of Bulgaria, addressed a letter to John bishop of Trani in Apulia, in which he attacked the Latin doctrine and usages with fanatical and blind zeal. The chief ground upon which he hereticated the Western church was a new one, *the use of unleavened bread* in the sacrament of the Supper, — a usage which certainly did not exist in the first eight centuries, common bread being universally employed, but which since the ninth century,¹ partly in order to approximate more nearly to the original passover feast which Christ himself kept, and partly in order to distinguish the sacra-

¹ Rabanus Maurus De institut. cleric. I. 31. Compare Hermann Hist. concertt. de pane azymo et fermentato.

mental bread from that of ordinary meals, had been introduced into the Western church, without hitherto awakening any scruples on the part of the Greek church. Michael thought he saw in the Latin usage a plain leaning towards Judaism, and gave to its advocates the name of *Azymites*. The letter came into the hands of the cardinal bishop *Humbert*, a zealous polemic, who immediately translated it, and sent it to pope Leo IX., who issued a treatise in defence of the Latin church, which was followed by one from Humbert in Constantinople. For political reasons, the controversy was very inopportune to the emperor *Constantine Monomachus*. He therefore purposed to bring about peace between the contending parties, and pope Leo, in 1054, at the emperor's suggestion sent three deputies (cardinal Humbert, the archbishop of Amalfi, and the archdeacon of Rome) to Constantinople, for the purpose of settling the difficulties. But these, with Humbert in the midst of them, only made matters worse. The humiliation, by the aid of the emperor, of the Greek Studite monk *Nicetas Pectoratus*, a violent opponent of the Latins, who was compelled to burn his polemic treatise before the eyes of the papal deputies, embittered the patriarch Michael in the highest degree. No imperial threats availed to make him yield, and both the clergy and people defended him. On the 16th of July, 1054, the papal deputies laid down upon the altar of the church of St. Sophia, a letter of excommunication against him. The patriarch immediately replied with a similar letter of excommunication against the pope, and the other Oriental patriarchs sided with the patriarch of Constantinople. *Peter*, the patriarch of Antioch, alone, upon the ground that the point of dispute was an unessential one, and that the Latin "barbarians" could not be expected to equal the Greeks in dogmatic accuracy, still counselled peace; but his voice met with no echo, and the schism between the Eastern and Western churches was now transmitted from century to century.

This contest nearly extinguished theological science in the Greek church. With the exceptions of *Photius* in the

ninth century, and *Simeon Metaphrastes* and *Oecumenius* in the tenth, the Greek church presents no important names during the whole of this period. *Metaphrastes* († 977) is the author of 122 *Vitae Sanctorum*¹; and *Oecumenius* composed a commentary, out of the writings of earlier exegetes, upon the Acts of the Apostles and the New Testament Epistles.² *Eutychius Saïd*, the contemporary of both († 940), patriarch of the Melchites at Alexandria, is the author of a chronicle of secular and sacred history written in Arabic³ (Ancient Church, § 6), — but his ecclesiastical relations were Asiatic rather than European.

Take

§ 122.

THEOLOGY IN THE WEST.

Launoïus De scholis celebrioribus a Carolo Maximo instauratis; *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, par des Benedictins.

Only in the first third, and last third, of this period, enclosing the dark tenth century between them, are there any signs of active theological life in the Latin church.

Theology, in the ninth century, owing to the lingering influence of the Carolingian age transmitted in the monasteries, took principally a *biblico-practical direction*, which was strengthened by the zealous study of the scriptures, together with the commentaries of the church Fathers, particularly Augustine. The more distinguished theologians of this school were: *Rabanus Maurus*,⁴ born at Mayence in 776, educated first at the cloister of Fulda and afterwards in Alcuin's seminary at Tours, deacon in 801, priest in 814,

¹ Leo Albatius De variis Simeonibus et Simeonum scriptis.

² Ed Morellus. Par. 1631.

³ Edited by Pococke Oxon 1658; Compare Renaudot *Historia patriarch. Alexandr. Jacobitarum*, p. 346 sq.

⁴ Opera ed Colvenerius. Compare Buddaeus *De vita ac doctrina Rabani*, and *Histoire Littéraire de la France* T. V. p. 151. sq.

appointed in 810 overseer of the cloister school at Fulda, abbot of Fulda from 822 to 842 (during which time he twice resigned the post and withdrew into solitude), elected archbishop of Mayence in 847, in which post he died in 856, — one of the most learned men of his time, and one of the most active in disseminating Christian knowledge, well known through his commentaries upon nearly the whole Bible, his Introduction to Theological Study for the use of clergymen (*De clericorum institutione*), his writings upon Morals (*De vitiis et virtutibus*), upon Church Discipline (*De disciplina ecclesiastica*), his Martyrology, Homilies, Poems (*De mysterio sancti crucis*), Letters, and his Grammatical and Philosophical Writings (*Etymologiae s. de universo*); secondly, *Claudius* bishop of Turin (§ 119), the author of many commentaries upon the Bible (of which only that upon Galatians has been printed); thirdly, *Walafrid Strabo*, born 807, educated at Fulda, abbot of the monastery at Reichenau where he died in 849, who, besides many poems and liturgical compositions, wrote a brief running commentary upon the whole Bible (*Glossa ordinaria in Biblia*),¹ which became the general manual of exegesis in the succeeding mediaeval centuries; fourthly, *Haymo*, born 778, educated at Tours, elected bishop of Halberstadt in 840, and died 853, the author of many Biblical commentaries and of a church history;² and lastly, *Christian Druthmar*, a monk of Corbie, afterwards a teacher, about 850, in the monasteries of Stavelo and Malmedy, who in his Commentary upon Matthew, in opposition to an arbitrary allegorizing, revived again the grammatical method of the Antiochian school.

This practical tendency towards the study of the Scriptures was strengthened, moreover, by the rise and cultivation of *Sacred Biblical Poetry*. In the ninth century, scriptural poems took the place, among the Germanic races, of the old pagan war songs. The earliest pieces of this kind that

¹ Ed. Antwerp. 1634.

² Ed. Maderus 1671. Compare Ancient Church § 6.

are extant, are the *Hildebrandslied*, and the *Wessobrun Prayer*, — a metrical supplication. Of a similar character is a poem upon the judgment, fragments of which have been preserved under the title of *Muspilli* (Penal fire). But the most important of these productions is a Low German, Old-Saxon work of the ninth century, the so-called *Heliand*, (i. e. Heiland or Saviour), — a sacred epic narrating, upon the basis of the four gospels, the life of Christ. It is one of the simplest and grandest specimens of early national poetry, and contributed greatly to popularize the gospel among the German races.¹ About thirty years later than the *Heliand*, appeared the poetical paraphrase in High German, of the Gospel Harmony, by *Otfried*.² Contemporaneously with these metrical paraphrases of the gospels upon the continent, were produced those Anglo-Saxon paraphrases in England, of portions of the Scriptures, which go under the name of *Cædmon*.

Besides these practico-biblical tendencies, a *contemplative mystical theology* sprang up in the Western church, in the ninth century. It took its first origin from the Greek church, through the writings of *Dionysius the Areopagite* (§ 105), which the emperor Michael Balbus sent in 824 to Lewis the Pious, who commissioned the abbot *Hilduin* († 840), and afterwards *Scotus Erigena*, to translate them. The influence of these writings was enhanced, moreover, by a work founded upon them, entitled *Areopagitica*, by Hilduin, in which the Pseudo-Dionysius is represented as the founder of the church at Paris (Ancient Church, § 18).³

¹ Edited by Schmeller, and translated into German by Grein.

² It is entitled *Krist*, and has been critically edited by Graff, and contained in Schilter's *Thesaurus Antiquitatum Teutonicarum*. Compare Lechler *Otfried's althochdeutsches Evangelium*, in *Theol. Studien*. 1848. See a metrical translation of a fragment of it by Coleridge, *Works* VII. 301-2. Upon the Old German Poetry compare Gervinus *Geschichte der poet. Nationallit.*

³ Contemporaneously with this ecclesiastical mysticism, the *Jewish Cabbala* poured out upon the Middle Ages a mass of works of a magical and theurgic cast. The first of them appear about 780. They emanate from Palestine and Persia, where Jewish seminaries flourished until the downfall of the Jewish patriarchate in 1038. In Europe, the first traces of the doctrines of the Cabbalists are seen in Italy and Southern France; from whence they pass into Northern

In close connection with this mysticism, and somewhat conditioned by it, some germs of a *speculative dialectical tendency* in theology made their appearance, particularly in the Irish monasteries. Its representative is *John Scotus Erigena*, who resided after 845 at the court of Charlemagne, and died about the year 877.¹ Educated by the study of Augustine, but still more of the Greek theologians Origen, Gregory Nyssa, Maximus, and particularly Dionysius the Areopagite, Scotus attempted, in opposition to a dogmatics based only upon the authority of the Scriptures and the church Fathers, to deduce Christianity and its doctrines philosophically, from the principles of reason, in a priori manner. Assuming that rational perception precedes faith, and is presupposed by it, he reversed the Augustinian maxim: *fides praeceedit intellectum*; and maintaining that God, as the object of pure intellectual intuition, is above all conceptions and predicates, — even the predicates of consciousness, love, and existence itself, — he distinguished a two-fold theology, — first, a negative theology (*Θεολογία ἀποφατική*), which evinces that every thing that is attributed, in the way of predicates, to the Divine and Eternal, is inadequate, and does not correspond to their essential nature; and, secondly, a positive theology (*Θεολογία καταφατική*), which adheres to the doctrines of Scripture and the church, as the human and finite symbols of the incomprehensible Infinite.² He unfolded his system at length, in his principal work, in five

Spain and Southern Germany. The most celebrated of these works is the *Sohar*, purporting to be the production of Simon Bar Jochai, but in reality a compilation made in Spain, about the year 1300, from old and new materials. The Cabbalistic doctrines found earnest opposers in the philosophical schools; particularly from Saadia of Egypt († 942), and Maimonides of Cordova († 1208).

¹ The statement that he returned to England, and in the year 866 was assassinated by his pupils at Malmesbury, is not reliable.

² Compare *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, T. V. p. 416; Hjort Joh. Scotus Erigena; Frommüller *Lehre des Joh. Scotus Erigena von Wesen des Bösen*, Tub. Zeitschrift 1830; Staudemauer *Joh. Scotus Erigena und die Wissenschaft seiner Zeit*; Saint René Taillandier *Scot Erigène et la philosophie scholastique*; Möller *Joh. Scotus Erigena und seine Irrthümer*; Helfferich *Christliche Mystik Theil 2*; Baur *Dreieinigkeitslehre II.* 262-344; Neander III. 460-467.

books, entitled *De divisione naturarum* (*περὶ φύσεων μερισμοῦ*).¹ Scotus exerted an important influence upon the theological thinking of his time, on the one hand, by the impulse which he gave towards a more profound inquiry after the inward meaning and connections of Christian doctrine, and on the other, by the mingling of Christianity with philosophy, — a philosophy, however, which, forgetting the limits of finite reason, was highly vitiating to positive historical Christianity, by transmuting it, partly into a pantheistic idealism, and partly into a superficial rationalism. Nevertheless, Scotus regarded Christ as the centre of all history, and was himself a devout man. Had he lived in the nineteenth century, the deleterious influence of his speculations would have been great. As it was, his own age, to whom he was virtually an intellectual alien, did not appreciate either the relatively good or the essentially bad in his teachings, and saw only in a dim and vague manner his deviation from the creed of the church. The rumor respecting his heresy came to the ears of *Nicholas I.*; but the pope would not lift the veil.

During the “dark” tenth century, there are scarcely any traces of the existence of theological science in the West. There were only individual quasi-theologians, only individual theological essays, and no scientific theology. *England* is the country in which the signs of theological inquiry are most apparent; but little is accomplished even here. The zealous endeavors of that truly great monarch *Alfred the Great*² (871–901) to revive learning and theological science, resulted in nothing that was permanent; although the re-

¹ Ed. Theophilus Gale, Oxon. 1681; also by H. T. Floss Par. 1853

² He learned the Latin language in his thirty-sixth year, translated Gregory's *Regula Pastoralis* and Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* into English, and desired “that as the Greeks and Latins, so likewise the English should have the law of God in their own tongue.” See Asserii (a monk of Wales, afterwards made bishop of Sherburn by Alfred) *Historia de rebus Alfredi*; Stolberg *Leben Alfreds*; Lorentz *Geschichte Alfreds*; Weisz *Geschichte Alfreds der Grosz*. Turner *History of Anglo-Saxons*; Lingard *History of England*; Hume *History of England*, Chapter II.; Pauli *Life and Writings of Alfred the Great* (Bohns Antiq. Library); Burke *Abridgement of English History*, Book II. Chap. iv; Milman *Latin Christianity*, Book V. Chap. x.

mainders of his influence are to be seen in the tenth century, in the labors of some bold bishops and ecclesiastics, — such for example, as *Dunstan* archbishop of Canterbury, the Anglican forerunner of Hildebrand, and a vehement champion for the reformation of the ignorant and vicious clergy upon Hildebrandian principles ; and *Ethelwold* bishop of Winchester, the teacher of *Aelfric* of Malmesbury, distinguished for his services in the beginning of the eleventh century in promoting Christian education. In *Germany*, the learned nun, *Roswitha* († 984) famous for her Latin poems, and *Notker Labeo*, abbot of St. Gall († 1022), the translator of portions of the Bible, stand entirely alone as persons of literary cultivation, and even they were lacking in genuine and accurate theological knowledge. In *Italy*, which had now become extremely illiterate and uncultivated, the only man of prominence, besides *Ratherius* of Verona (§ 116) the zealous opponent of the prevailing ignorance and corruption, was *Atto* bishop of Vercelli (945 — 960), remarkable for his thorough study of the Scriptures, who composed a valuable commentary on the Pauline Epistles.

Not until towards the close of the present period, and exactly at the time when the church had nearly completed the first millennium of its existence, and under the consciousness of its corruptions and ill-desert was expecting the day of judgment, was there a new awakening of spiritual life, and thereby of theological science, in Western Christendom. It commenced in *France*, under the influence particularly of *Gerbert* archbishop of Rheims, afterwards Pope *Sylvester* II. (999 — 1003), a man who had acquired an amount of learning among the Spanish Arabians that astonished his cotemporaries, and who planted the germs of a scientific spirit, first at the seminary of Rheims, and afterward throughout the French church.¹ Flourishing theological schools arose at Chartres under *Fulbert* († 1028), a pupil of Gerbert,

¹ Besides mathematical and astronomical writings, Gerbert composed a treatise *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, a remarkable tract *De rationali et ratione uti* (in Petz Thesaurus II. 2), *Sermons and Letters*, — the last mentioned edited by Du Chesne Scriptt. rerum Francicar. T. II.

and at the cloister of Bec in Normandy through the influence of *Lanfranc*. The career and influence of Lanfranc are remarkable. Born about 1005, in Pavia, he pursued for a time the study of law, became a monk at Bec in 1042, abbot of Caen in 1062, and archbishop of Canterbury in 1072, in which office he died in 1089, — a man who in political¹ as well as ecclesiastical affairs acquired a far-reaching reputation, and prepared the way for the scientific theology of the Middle Ages, the *Scholastic* spirit and system.²

§ 123.

PREDESTINARIAN CONTROVERSY.

Usher Gotteschalci, et de praedestinatione controversiae ab eo motae, Historia; Cellotius Historia Gotteschalci praedestiniani; Hottinger Diatribe; Neander Vol. III. 471-494. The original documents are to be found in Mauguin Vett. auctorum, qui sec. IX. de praedestinatione et gratia scripserunt, opera et fragmenta.

The Augustinian system, in its essential features, had been ecclesiastically authorized, in the sixth century, at the councils of Orange and Valence, in opposition to Semi-Pelagianism (Ancient Church, § 93); but it was done in a way that must necessarily produce misunderstandings and difficulties in future. These now showed themselves. Many in this period, though standing substantially upon the Augustinian foundation, endeavored to avoid or cover over the severe side of the doctrine of predestination, — its relations, namely to sin, — and were inclined to that milder type of Augustinianism which appears in the work entitled *De vocatione gentium* (Ancient Church, § 93), in which the stress is laid upon the predestination to holiness. To all

¹ He was the counsellor of *William the Conqueror*, and induced the pope to sanction the Norman conquest of England.

² He was the author of a Commentary upon the Pauline Epistles, several Discourses, Letters, and Tracts, against Berengarius. Opera ed. D'Achery, Par. 1648. Compare Hasse Anselm von Canterbury Th. I.

such persons, an unambiguous and decided application of the Augustinian doctrine of predestination, in the direction of reprobation as well as of election, appeared of doubtful or dangerous tendency. Thus there arose, in the ninth century, a remarkable controversy between the strict and moderate adherents of Augustine,—with the latter of whom sided many of the Semi-Pelagians who misunderstood their position, and the whole multitude of the worldly-minded and latitudinarian. The controversy was remarkable, both in respect to the personal feelings, and the dogmatic points, that were involved.

Gottschalk, the son of a Saxon count, had in childhood been presented (oblatus) by his parents to the monastery of Fulda, but had obtained a release from his monastic vows from the synod of Mayence in 820. The decision of the synod was reversed by the emperor Lewis the Pious, through the representations of the abbot of Fulda, *Rabanus Maurus*. He then entered the monastery of Orbais in the diocese of Soisson, as his relations to Rabanus were no longer pleasant. Here he became a diligent student of the writings of Augustine, and an enthusiastic advocate of the doctrine of unconditional predestination. His interest in this doctrine was very deep, having a double root in his practical experience and his strongly speculative understanding, and he began to accuse the greater portion of his contemporaries of Semi-Pelagianism, because they had forgotten or avoided it. This he did in a public manner, on his return from a pilgrimage to Rome in 847, at a convent on the estate of *Eberhard* count of Friaul, and in the presence of *Notting* bishop of Verona. Being informed of this, Rabanus Maurus, now archbishop of Mayence, addressed two tracts to Notting and Eberhard in opposition to Gottschalk, in which he represents his doctrine as detestable, at the same time misconceiving and misrepresenting it. Gottschalk taught the following propositions, in full harmony with Augustine: Since the fall of the first man, which was a voluntary and guilty act, all men are by nature in one and the same condition of corruption, and through this first sin

of Adam, in whom the whole race sinned, and its propagation whereby it becomes personal to each individual, merit eternal condemnation. Out of this sum-total, God, according to an unconditional decree, mercifully chooses a number, to whom he imparts the grace necessary in order to their conversion, and leaves the remainder to be punished according to the requirements of law and justice. Gottschalk employed the phrase *praedestinatio duplex* (gemina), which had already been used by Fulgentius of Ruspe (§ 93) and Isidore of Seville, and explained his views in the following manner: God from all eternity *foreknew*, but did not predestinate, sin. He *predestinates* only that which is good, and never that which is evil. But the good is of two kinds, — the blessings of mercy (*beneficia gratiae*), and the retributions of justice (*judicia justitiae*). Both of these are equally the result of the divine foreordination; and hence it is as proper to speak of a predestination of the non-elect (not indeed to *sin*, but) to endless punishment, as of the elect to endless reward. Augustine — although he,¹ and particularly Fulgentius of Ruspe, sometimes expressed himself in a manner similar to that of Gottschalk,² — commonly confines the term “predestination” to the election to eternal life, and designates the preterition of the lost and their sentence to per-

¹ As, for example, in his *Enchiridion* § 100: Dominus bene utens et malis, ad eorum damnationem, quos juste *praedestinavit* ad poenam, et ad eorum salutem, quos benigne *praedestinavit* ad gratiam.

² Credo siquidem atque confiteor, praescisse te ante saecula quaecunque erant futura sive bona sive mala; *praedestinasse* vero tautumodo bona. Confessio prolixior Gotteschalci in Usher's Works, IV. 212.

Respecting the more difficult subject of the relation of the divine decree to the origin of sin itself, Gottschalk appears to have held that the sin of Adam, which is the antecedent of the two-fold predestination, that to perdition and that to salvation, is not predestinated but foreknown (*praescitus*). His preference for the word “*praescire*” to designate the relation of God to moral evil, evidently sprang from the fact that the term “*predestinare*,” in his view, implied a *direct and creative efficiency*. This, he believed, was exerted only in the instance of the origination of holiness, either in the unfallen or the fallen man. But, taking into view his anxiety to maintain the sovereignty of God in relation to man's *perdition* as well as man's salvation, it is probable that Gottschalk's application of the term “*praescire*” was equivalent to what is now understood by the “*permissive decree*.” — *Translator*.

dition, by the term "reprobation." This system of Gottschalk was misrepresented by Rabanus Maurus, to the degree that he accused Gottschalk of holding that the elect were sure of eternal happiness, no matter how vicious their life might be, and that the reprobate were sure of eternal misery, no matter how earnest might be their endeavor after holiness; whereas Gottschalk uniformly represented predestination as predestination to holiness, and all endeavors after holiness as the result of a divine grace imparted to the elect. This misrepresentation upon the part of Rabanus was all the more reprehensible, even if unintentional, inasmuch as his own doctrine of grace and regeneration was essentially Augustinian, though concealing as much as possible the point of predestination, and mitigating its severity.¹

Firmly convinced of the correctness and orthodoxy of his views, Gottschalk did not hesitate to appear at a synod at Mayence, in 848, before Lewis, king of Germany, and Rabanus; but he was excommunicated as a heretic, and sent to his metropolitan, *Hincmar*, archbishop of Rheims, for his supervision. Hincmar summoned him before the *Synod of Chiersy*, in 849, where he was condemned a second time; and because he would not recant was inhumanly scourged as a refractory monk. Afterwards, being put to torture, under the stress of the pain he cast into the flames a work which he had composed in defence of his views, out of passages of Scripture and the Fathers, and was sent to the monastery of Hautvilliers for close confinement for life, and with the intention of working a change in his opinions. But none of his sufferings caused Gottschalk to waver in his convictions. Two so-called *Confessiones*,² written in his captivity, enunciate his old views in the boldest and most fundamental manner possible, and he offered to undergo

¹ Rabanus took the following positions, which are substantially those of the author of the work *De vocatione gentium*: God desires that all men should be saved; yet only those are saved to whom he imparts the necessary grace; that this grace is bestowed upon some and not upon others, is owing to an incomprehensible decree of God; it is sufficient to know that God is compassionate, holy, and just; man's powers of comprehension are limited.

² Republished in Usher's Works, IV. 207 sq.

the ordeal by fire in proof of the truth of his sentiments; but his proposal was not accepted. After an imprisonment of twenty years, death put an end to his sufferings, in 869. He died in prison, and without the privilege of partaking of the sacrament of the supper, because he had steadily and to the end refused to recant.

The fortunes of Gottschalk's doctrine were entirely different from those of Gottschalk himself. It was even recommended to favor by the sufferings of its advocate. The hasty condemnation and unrighteous treatment which he had met with very soon wakened an interest in his system, and raised up many defenders of it. Pope *Nicholas I.*, to whom Gottschalk had made his appeal without success, afterward seemed almost upon the point of favoring him and his doctrine. But the principal agents in effecting a change in public opinion respecting the views and endeavors of Gottschalk, were three highly gifted and influential ecclesiastics, — *Prudentius* bishop of Troyes¹ († 861); the learned monk *Ratramnus* of Corbie² († 868); and the abbot *Servatus Lupus*³ of Ferrieres in the diocese of Sens, distinguished for Christian moderation, in conjunction with remarkable learning, acuteness, and power of lucid statement. In order to obtain a coadjutor upon his side, Hincmar, foolishly enough, now betook himself, through the medium of king Charles the Bald, to *Scotus Erigena*.⁴ But such assistance as that of Scotus, who laid down positions like these, — that for God, as a being beyond all the limitations of time, there is no before (*prae*) nor after; that for the deity evil is a negation and thus a nonentity, and therefore that all divine punishment is merely an internal effect of the sub-

¹ Prudentii Trecassini Epistola ad Hincmarum (written in 849).

² Ratramnus De praedestinatione (written about 850).

³ Servatus Lupus De tribus quaestionibus (namely, De libero arbitrio, De praedestinatione bonorum et malorum, and De sanguinis Christi superflua taxatione, — this latter discussing the question whether Christ died for the salvation of all men, or only of the elect), written about 850. Opera Servati Lupi ed. Baluzius Antio. 1710.

⁴ Scotus Erigena De praedestinatione Dei contra Gotteschalcum; written in 851.

jective relation of the creature to God, and no positive infliction (compare § 121), — did the cause of Hincmar more harm than good, and called out several new defences of Gottschalk, from *Prudentius*¹ above-mentioned, from *Florus Magister*² a presbyter of Lyons († 860), and from *Remigius*³ the archbishop of Lyons († 875). From the heresies which were clearly apparent in Scotus, the reputation of Hincmar himself suffered. Hence he was the more anxious to secure an acknowledged orthodox, and regularly *ecclesiastical* testimony in behalf of his party. This he was able to obtain without difficulty, inasmuch as the recent dogmatic tendency in the church had been away from, and in opposition to, the views of Gottschalk. The *second Synod of Chiersy*, in 853, at which king Charles the Bald was present, laid down four propositions in opposition to the Gottschalkian doctrine.⁴ Nevertheless, the synod, in reality, took no position that essentially conflicted with the Augustinian system. On the contrary, it entirely harmonized with the views of Gottschalk, in that it affirmed that only the first man previous to the fall possessed a really free will; that through his fall the whole human race has come into condemnation; that in this condition each man is by nature free only to evil, that he can acquire freedom to good only through regenerating grace;⁵ and that the reason why a certain number attain to this grace and to salvation, is God's predestination. The Semi-Pelagian, Anti-Augustinian shibboleth, that it is within the power of the human will to incline towards divine grace, or to exclude it, received no endorsement from the synod; and their tempered Augustinianism only so far varied from the system of their opponents that, first, they denied a *twofold* predestination, asserting only one, which had reference either to the bestowment

¹ Tractatus de predestinatione contra Joh. Scotum (written in 852).

² De predestinatione contra Scoti erroneas definitiones.

³ De tribus epistolis (namely, of Rabanus Maurus, Hincmar, and Pardulus bishop of Laon).

⁴ Mansi Tom. XIV. p. 920.

⁵ "Habemus liberum arbitrium ad bonum, praevenit et adjutum gratia; et habemus liberum arbitrium ad malum, desertum gratia."

of saving grace or of just retribution, — God, in the latter instance, simply predestinating punishment to those whom he leaves to their merited condemnation, but not predestinating them to punishment¹; and, secondly, that they made prominent the position, that God wills the salvation of *all* men, though not all are saved, and that Christ suffered for *all*, though all are not redeemed by his sufferings: in brief, that the salvation of the saved is a gift of divine grace, and the perdition of the lost is their own guilt.² But although these positions bordered so closely upon the Gottschalkian doctrine, they were not sufficiently satisfactory to prevent the party of Gottschalk from desiring to obtain for their own views a counterbalancing ecclesiastical authority. Hence, under the lead of Remigius, the *Synod of Valence*, in 855, set forth, in opposition to the four propositions of the second Synod of Chiersy, six propositions enunciating a strict Augustinianism, in which a *praedestinatio duplex* is asserted, though with the express declaration added, that God has neither predestinated sin nor any man to sin. They also refer redemption to all baptized members of the church, and to such alone; but, from this number, again, only a portion actually attain eternal life, because through grace they persevere, while the remainder, in the exercise of self-will, fail to continue in the faith of which they were once partakers. That between the statements of these two synods, there was more contradiction in the phraseology than in the ideas, — which upon both sides were founded in the Augustinian and Anti-Semipelagian system, — could not escape the heads of the parties themselves; and hence Hincmar and Remigius agreed, in 859, to unite in conven-

¹ “Deus elegit ex massa perditionis, secundum praescientiam suam, quos per gratiam praedestinavit ad vitam, et vitam illis praedestinavit aeternam. Caeteros autem, quos justitiae iudicio in massa perditionis reliquit, perituros praescivit, sed non, ut perirent, praedestinavit. Poenam autem illis, quia justus est, praedestinavit aeternam. Ac per hoc unam dei praedestinationem tantummodo dicimus, quae aut ad donum pertinet gratiae aut ad retributionem justitiae.”

² “Deus omnes homines sine exceptione vult salvos fieri, licet non omnes salvantur. Quod autem quidam salvantur, salvantis est donum; quod autem quidam pereunt, pereuntium est meritum.”

ing a synod that should draw up a common creed. But the synod never was convened, and the controversy closed with a voluminous treatise by *Hincmar* against *Gottschalk*,¹ in which, with diffuse and illogical verbosity, he covered up the Augustinian doctrine of predestination.

§ 124.

SACRAMENTARIAN CONTROVERSY.

Among the Fathers of the first six centuries, there were three views of the relation of the symbols in the Lord's Supper to the divine fact signified. The first was, that there is an inward union and penetration of the bread and wine with the body and blood of Christ; the second, that the bread and wine are symbolical signs, with which the body and blood of Christ stand in a supernatural and sanctifying connection; and the third, that there is a complete separation between the signs as mere symbols, and the divine fact represented by them, while yet there is a supernatural and sanctifying influence connected with the administration of the sacrament. The first view was held by Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Hilary of Poitiers, Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, and Theodoret; the second view was advocated by Tertullian, Cyprian, Athanasius, and Augustine; and the third theory was adopted by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius of Caesarea, and Gregory Nazianzen. Among all these Fathers, with perhaps the exception of Gregory Nyssa, no traces can be discovered of the later Papal doctrine of transubstantiation. But after the seventh century, and particularly in the eighth and ninth, the tendency of the whole church was

¹ De prædestinatione dei et libero arbitrio. Opera Hincmari Ed. Sirmond, Par. 1645. Respecting Hincmar, compare Fodoard (canonicus at Rheims † 966) Hist. eccl. Rhem.; Gesz Leben und Schriften Hinkmars.

more and more to the theory of a magical conversion of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, — a change in which the substance is converted, but the accidents or external marks (color, taste, etc.) remain, to afford an opportunity for the exercise of faith.

This doctrine, which from the twelfth century onward received the name of *Transubstantiation*, was clearly and definitely enunciated in the ninth century by *Paschasius Radbert* abbot of Corbie († 865), in his treatise *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, composed in the year 831.¹ In this work he maintained that in the act of consecration, God produces the true body and true blood of Christ, in such a mode that the body of Christ consecratur ex substantia panis et vini, while yet the external marks of the bread and wine remain.² In confirmation of the doctrine, he refers to the alleged appearance of the blood of Christ, in the place of the bread and wine, after these had been consecrated by the hands of Gregory the Great, — a reference that shows how deeply the doctrine had penetrated the popular belief of the time. But this open and explicit statement of Paschasius awakened decided doubts, and some opposition, in several quarters, particularly from the monk *Frudegard* who appealed to the views of Augustine,³ and from *Rabanus Maurus*. Upon the issuing of a second edition of the work of Paschasius for popular use, in 844, King Charles the Bald, to whom it was dedicated, asked *Ratramnus* (see § 122) to give him his opinion of it. Ratramnus, in reply, composed his treatise *De corpore et sanguine Domini*,⁴ in which he

¹ Contained in Martene et Durand. Vett. scriptor. Collectio. T. IX p. 367 sq. Radbert has also left exegetical writings, a treatise *De fide, spe, et caritate*, and a work *De partu virginis* in which he maintains not only the doctrine of a miraculous conception, but also of a miraculous delivery.

² “Panis et vinum nihil aliud quam caro Christi et sanguis post consecrationem credenda sunt; non alia plane (caro) quam quae nata est de Maria et passa in cruce et resurrexit de sepulchro.” At the same time he says: “Christum vorari fas dentibus non est; . . . hoc sane nutriunt (Christi corpus et sanguis) in nobis, quod ex Deo natum est, et non, quod ex carne et sanguine.”

³ See a valuable note upon the views of Augustine, and of the Early Church generally, respecting the Lord's Supper, in Gieseler Church History I. 435, Smith's Ed.

⁴ Ed. Boileau, Par. 1712.

opposed the doctrine of Paschasius, without, however, naming him, and affirmed only a spiritual presence of Christ in the sacramental supper, apprehensible by faith and the faithful alone.¹ But the treatise of Ratramnus availed the less towards a change in the current sentiment of the church, from the fact that there were many expressions in it that savored of transubstantiation,² and helped to promote this theory. Several other theologians also, — Walafrid Strabo, Druthmar, and Florus, — agreed essentially with Ratramnus. Even *Scotus Erigena*, — if the account is to be believed, — at the request of Charles the Bald, gave his opinion about the year 862, in harmony with that of Ratramnus, and in opposition to that of Paschasius Radbert. The theory of transubstantiation, however, continued to be the dominant one in the church, and after this controversy became more and more so. There were advocates of a middle theory during the tenth century, — namely, *Ratherius*,³ *Gerbert* (afterwards Pope Sylvester II.), and others, — but their voices were not heard; and by the eleventh century opposition to transubstantiation was reckoned heresy.

Towards the end of the eleventh century *Berengarius* stood forth as the decided and intelligent opponent of the reigning sacramental theory. He was born in Tours, about 1000, trained in Fulbert's school at Chartres, since 1030 superintendent of a cathedral school (scholasticus) at Tours, and since 1040 arch-deacon of Angers. The doubts respecting transubstantiation, which he had now and then expressed to his friends, had already excited suspicion of heresy concerning him, when a letter⁴ which he wrote to Lan-

¹ Neander Church History, III. 498.

² "Convertitur panis in corpus Christi, operante invisibiliter Spiritu Sancto."

³ He maintained, however, the substance of the theory of transubstantiation, in holding to the miraculous conversion of the elements into the body and blood of Christ. Only the manner in which it was done should not be inquired into.

⁴ In Mansi Tom. XIX. 768. See Bernaldus Const. De Berengarii damnatione, in Mansi Tom. XIX. 757; Lessing Berengarius Turonensis; Staüdlin Berengarius Turonensis; Sudendorf Berengarius Turonensis; Tschirner Archiv für Kirchengeschichte Bd. II. 1-98.

franc, abbot of Bec, and which Lanfranc sent to Rome, wherein Berengarius, without expressing a definite opinion respecting the eucharist, decisively condemned the view of Paschasius Radbert, excited Lanfranc and a great portion of the church against him. Without a hearing, he and his doctrine were condemned by pope *Leo IX.* at a *Council of Rome* in 1050. A new synod was convened by the pope, to meet at *Vercelli*, in the same year; at which Berengarius should be present. But before it assembled, Berengarius was thrown into prison by order of the king of France, probably on the ground that he had already been condemned as heretical by a French council. The synod met at *Vercelli*, and condemned the doctrine of Berengar, together with that of Scotus, with such fanatical zeal, that two clergymen of *Tours* who volunteered to defend the absent Berengar could be saved from the violence of the multitude only by being arrested and thrown into prison. Through the influence of his friends, particularly of *Eusebius Bruno*, bishop of Angers, Berengar was released from prison, and introduced to the acquaintance of *Hildebrand*, the now powerful papal legate who was making a journey into France. Hildebrand, independent and reflecting, and in all probability not inclined to the doctrine of transubstantiation, but content with the simple Scripture statement, that in the sacrament the bread and wine became the body and blood of Christ, without inquiry respecting the mode, appeared to be satisfied, first at a private interview, and afterwards at the *Synod of Tours*, in 1054, with the declaration of Berengar, that he did not deny the presence of Christ in the sacrament of the supper, but held that the bread and wine after consecration were the body and blood of the Lord.¹ This statement Berengar confirmed with an oath, to satisfy the doubts of the French bishops respecting his sincerity. The doctrine of *Berengarius*, which is best stated in his treatise *De Sacra Coena*² written in reply to Lanfranc, certainly allowed of such an explanation; for although he not only denied transubstantia-

¹ Compare Neander Church History, III. 521 sq.

² Ed. Vischer Berol. 1834.

tion, but every kind of *corporeal substantial* presence of Christ in the Supper, in the most explicit terms, and, interpreting the words of institution in a tropical manner, assumed only a spiritual presence of Christ (the whole Christ, his body not excluded) for faith and the believer, he nevertheless asserted that the outward signs were equivalent for the believer, to the actual presence of Christ, to his actual body and blood, inasmuch as by means of his faith he entered into a supernatural communion with Christ,¹ and, although he preferred the term *consecratio*, hesitated not to speak as did Ratramus, of a *conversio* of the elements. But as Berengar's sworn declaration at Tours was not, perhaps, entirely unequivocal, and might lead to deception respecting his real opinions, so also the result of the examination introduced by Hildebrand, disappointed expectations. Pope Leo IX., through whom Hildebrand hoped to accomplish something, died too early. During the pontificates of the two following popes there were no proceedings in reference to Berengar; so that at length, in 1059, he boldly resolved to make a journey to Rome, in order, through the influence of Hildebrand, to obtain the favorable influence of pope *Nicholas II.*, to counteract the power of the opposing party. But this party, led by cardinal *Humbert* at Rome, was too strong for him. A *synod of Rome* in 1059, laid before Berengarius a confession of faith, drawn up by Humbert, which expressly taught that, after the act of consecration, the bread and wine are the true body of Christ, and that this is visibly broken by the hands of the priest; and masticated by the teeth of the believer; and Berengar, usually bold and confident, but now fearful and trembling, swore acceptance. He was free now to return to France; and the first thing he did upon his return was, with great bitterness, to withdraw his confession. Without any concealment he proclaimed his old view,

¹ "Verum Christi corpus in ipsa mensa proponitur, sed spiritualiter interiori homini ut vere dici possit, et ipsum corpus nos sumere, et tamen non ipsum; ipsum quidem quantum ad essentiã veraeque naturae proprietatem atque naturam; non ipsum autem, si spectes panis vinique speciem." — Berengarius De s. coena.

defended it in writings against Lanfranc, and both spoke and wrote with the most extreme violence against the Roman church. A friendly letter of pope *Alexander II.*, requesting him to desist from his errors, was replied to by Berengar with a haughty refusal. Nevertheless, nothing was done at Rome to compel him to renounce his views; but in France he was attacked on all sides. Bishop Bruno, participating in Hildebrand's view of the eucharist, sought earnestly, but in vain, to unite both parties. At length, owing to the increasing importance of the matter, Hildebrand, now pope *Gregory VII.*, summoned Berengar to Rome in 1078, with the intention, undoubtedly, of bringing in a settlement that would be acceptable to all parties. At the *synod of Rome*, in 1078, he induced Berengar to swear to a confession of faith which he had himself drawn up, and which it was possible for Berengar to interpret in agreement with his own views.¹ Hildebrand, by means of this act of Berengar, sought earnestly to remove the dissension and unite all parties; and professed to have received through a revered monk a communication from the Virgin Mary, to the effect that Berengar's acceptance of the confession was sufficient. But Berengar's opponents now began to express suspicions concerning the orthodoxy of the pope himself; and desirous as Gregory was to protect Berengar, he was by no means ready to sacrifice for the interest of his client a far more precious interest,—the plan, namely, of establishing a papal theocracy in opposition to the secular power,—for the realization of which, the universal belief in his orthodoxy was indispensable. At the *second synod of Rome*, in 1079, a second confession of faith was presented to Berengar, which expressly declared that the bread and wine are *substantialiter* converted into the body and blood of Christ. Berengar sought to explain the confession in accordance with

¹ "Profiteor panem altaris post consecrationem esse verum corpus Christi, quod natum est de Virgine, quod passum est in cruce, quod sedet ad dexteram Patris; et vinum altaris, postquam consecratum est, esse verum sanguinem, qui manavit de latere Christi. Et sicut ore pronuncio, ita me corde habere confirmo; sic me adjuvet Deus et haec sacra."

his own views, and finally referred to his last private conversations with the pope. The pope then commanded him to fall upon his knees, and abjure his errors; and Berengar, who had not the courage to undergo martyrdom for his convictions, did what the pope commanded. Under the papal protection he returned to France, where he lived a solitary penitent, in strict asceticism, to an advanced age, in the island of St. Coem, near Tours,—dying in the year 1088.

§ 125.

DOGMATICO-HISTORICAL SURVEY.

The general dogmatic character of the preceding period (See § 110) continues in this, so that the results of dogmatic inquiry are comparatively small.

1. In respect to *Inspiration*, during the first half of the ninth century a controversy arose between *Fredegis*, a nobleman, and *Agobard*, archbishop of Lyons. The latter contended that the language of the New Testament was not entirely faultless in grammatical respects,—a view which *Fredegis* opposed as incompatible with the doctrine of verbal inspiration. *Agobard*, in reply, composed a tract in which he attempted to prove that God imparted, not diction, but thoughts and sentiments alone, to the prophets and apostles.

2. The Occidental doctrine of the *Procession of the Holy Spirit from Father and Son* had begun to be a definite point of dispute between the two divisions of the church, in the preceding period. An open outbreak of the controversy was first occasioned by *Photius*, bishop of Constantinople, during his contests with pope *Nicholas I.* (§ 120), who issued two circular letters, about 867, in which he accused the Latin church of heresy respecting the doctrine of the Holy Ghost,—citing in behalf of his views John xv. 26, and urging the speculative reasons involved in the position of a monarchy in the Trinity. At the request of the pope, *Aeneas* of Paris,

and *Ratramnus*, each defended the Western theory, — citing John xv. 26, xvi. 14, with other texts, and urging the speculative reasons founded in the consubstantiality of the Father and Son, and the Augustine trinitarianism generally. Thus the dogmatic differences between the East and West were strengthened.

3. In respect to the doctrine of *Grace and Predestination*, two parties were formed, owing to the course which the development of these truths had taken in previous periods, — that of strict Augustinianism, and that of Semi-Pelagianism which, while professing to follow Augustine, softened the severity, and concealed the logical results of his system. These parties engaged in earnest conflict; both found theological champions, and both obtained ecclesiastical recognition.

4. At the conclusion of this period, there were in existence three modes of apprehending the *Sacrament of the Supper*, — the victorious theory of transubstantiation with *Lanfranc* for its champion; the defeated theory of *Berengarius*, which denied the real substantial presence of the body and blood of Christ in any form of statement; and the theory of *Bruno* and *Hildebrand*, which retained the essential characteristics of the old patristic scheme, asserting the real presence after consecration, but leaving the manner an unexplained mystery of faith (§ 123).

§ 126

SECTS.

As a Gnostico-Mystic reaction against the formalism and materialism of the church and its tendencies, the Oriental sect of *Paulicians* passed over into this period from the preceding one. The *Eastern Paulicians* remained in Tephrica (§ 111), from fear of the bordering Greeks, until *Basil the Macedonian*, in 871, destroyed this their chief city. Never-

theless, a considerable party of them still remained in the region, and were urged by their political misfortunes, so much the more earnestly to propagate their faith in other countries, especially in the newly-founded Bulgarian church. The further extension of the sect was promoted by the transportation, by *John Tzimisce*, in 970, of a great portion of them into the region of Philippopolis in Thrace.

From the Paulicians in Bulgaria, and, if such there were, from those oriental sects kindred to them, who, like the Paulicians, notwithstanding their Gnostico-Manichæan characteristics, were marked by many beautiful expressions of a practical and living Christianity, and in whose communion many members of the catholic church took refuge, failing to find in their own communion the hearty and earnest religion for which they yearned, — from these sources, in all probability, are to be derived all those *Occidental Mystic Sects* who by their contemporaries were grouped under the general name of Manichæan, and who, notwithstanding all their neglect or contempt of the catholic church, yet observed as much as possible the customary forms of Christian worship, and oftentimes were distinguishable from catholic Christians only by a stricter asceticism. These various sects, during the distractions of the tenth and eleventh centuries, scattered themselves through Italy, France, the Netherlands, and Germany. Respecting their doctrinal belief, we have, unfortunately, no very accurate accounts. There are notices of a *sect in Aquitania*, about 1010, that rejected the sign of the cross and baptism, — agreeing in this latter respect with the Paulicians, who, like several later sects in the Middle Ages, substituted for baptism the laying on of hands (*consolamentum*), with which they supposed the imparting of the Holy Ghost was connected. About the year 1017 or 1022, we hear of a *sect at Orleans*, to which even some distinguished clergymen and overseers of the then flourishing theological school at Orleans belonged. This sect was probably evangelical in respect to the doctrine of human merits, gnostic in its rejection of the doctrine of creation *de nihilo*, and held docetic, and other gnostic

errors, concerning Christ's person. Before an assembly of bishops at Orleans, its advocates expressed a firm conviction of its future wide prevalence, but evaded the questions that were asked them, by a scornful reference to those who put credit in the "inventions of fleshly men, written upon parchment," declaring that they themselves received no doctrine but that which was written by the Holy Spirit in the inner man. Thirteen of their number died courageously at the stake. About the year 1025, a sect arose in the *diocese of Arras and Cambray*, founded by *Gundulf* an Italian, whose members were mostly from the lower classes. They professed before the civil tribunal that "their doctrine was in accordance with the gospel, and consisted in the renunciation of the world, in overcoming sinful desires, living by the labor of the hands, and in the exercise of brotherly love towards all men. Whoever should do these things needed no baptism, and baptism would not benefit any one not doing these things. Baptism, as was evident from the viciousness of thousands of baptizing priests, and baptized laymen, possessed no efficacy, and in the case of infants certainly could have none, as they were incapable of a conscious act of faith." Most of this sect, however, though the preaching of archbishop *Gerhard*, were induced to return to the catholic church. Still another sect, in *Montfort*, near Turin, was brought to notice by archbishop *Heribert* of Milan, during one of his journeys of visitation, about the year 1030. They appear to have held a mystical idealism, — regarding the whole history of Christ's life as an allegorical representation of the inner religious life; asserting that the true Son of God is nothing else than each human soul enlightened by God; and boasting that they followed a pope without the tonsure, who daily visited all their brethren scattered throughout the world, and who imparted to them forgiveness of sins. They were so confident of the truth of their idealizing Christianity, that most of them did not hesitate, when the alternative was presented either to adore the cross or go to the stake, to choose the latter. Lastly, about the year 1052, a sect appeared at *Goslar* whose members,

among other peculiarities, abstained from animal food, and who by imperial orders were put to death, — it having now become a general custom to inflict the death-penalty upon heretics, though *Wazo* (†1048), the excellent bishop of Liege, raised his voice, in vain, against it.

Year.	
590—814	THIRD PERIOD.
590	Gregory the Great. — Irish Missions : Columbanus, Gallus, and others.
595	Gregory of Tours dies.
597	Columba dies. — The monk Augustine and his co-missionaries in England.
600	Goar upon the Rhine.
601	Synod of Wigorn.
601—610	Phocas emperor of the Greeks.
604	Gregory the Great dies.
605	Laurentius, Augustine's successor in England.
606	John Eleemosynarius patriarch of Alexandria.
611—641	Heraclius emperor.
613	Gallus at St. Gall.
614	Chosroes takes Jerusalem.
615	Columbanus dies.
622	The Hegira.
625—638	Honorius bishop of Rome.
630	Mohammed takes Mecca.
632	Mohammed dies. — Abubekr first caliph.
633	Isidore of Seville dies. Monothelite controversy kindled.
634	Sophronius patriarch of Jerusalem. Omar second caliph.
635	The Koran collected.
637	Omar takes Jerusalem.
638	Heraclius's ἐκθροισις.
640	Gallus dies.
642—649	Theodorus bishop of Rome.
642—648	Constans II. emperor.
646	Theodore pronounces the ban upon the patriarchs of Constantinople.
648	Τύπος of the emperor.
649	Martin I. bishop of Rome. First Lateran Synod at Rome.
650	Kilian in France.
655	Council of Toledo.
657—684	Sylvanus the Paulician.
668—685	The emperor Constantinus Pogonatus the persecutor of the Paulicians.
669	Theodore archbishop of Canterbury.
678—682	Agatho bishop of Rome.
680	Sixth oecumenical council (First Trullan) at Constantinople, in opposition to Monothelitism.
683	Winifried (Boniface the apostle to the Germans) born.
685—695	Justinian II. emperor.
690	Theodore of Canterbury died.
692	Second Trullan council (Quinextum).
696	Willebrord among the Frankish Frieslanders.
701	John Maro died.
705—711	Justinian II emperor again.
711	Spain in possession of the Saracens.
711—713	Philippicus Bardanes emperor.
713	Suidbert died in Westphalia.

Year.	
714	Pipin died.
715	First missionary tour of Winifried among the Frieslanders.
715—731	Gregory II. pope.
717	Charles Martel conquers Radbod.
717—741	Emperor Leo III. the Isaurian. Beginning of Image Controversy.
718	Winifried deputed from Rome to the German mission.
722	Winifried in Thuringia and Hessa.
723	Winifried appointed bishop (Boniface) by Gregory II. of Rome.
726	King Leo's edict against Image worship.
730	Second edict against Image worship.
731—741	Gregory III. pope.
732	Boniface archbishop and apostolical Vicar. Charles Martel victorious over the Saracens at Poitiers.
735	Bede dies.
739	Willebrord dies.
741	Charles Martel dies.
741—752	Zacharias pope.
741.—775	Constantinus Copronymus emperor
742	First German provincial synod.
744	Sturmi founds the cloister of Fulda.
745	Boniface archbishop of Mayence.
747	Carlomann monk. Synod of Cloveshove.
752	Pipin deposes Childerick III. Boniface anoints Pipin.
752—768	Pipin king of the Franks.
752—757	Stephen II. pope.
754	Council at Constantinople against Image worship.
755	Boniface suffers martyrdom. Pepin conquers Astulph the Lombard.
757—767	Paul I. pope.
760	John Damascene dies.
768—814	Charlemagne.
772—795	Hadrian I. pope.
772—803	Charlemagne makes war against the Saxons.
774	Charlemagne overthrows the kingdom of the Lombards.
775—780	Leo IV. Greek emperor.
780	First Cabalistic writings.
782	Alcuin in France.
787	Seventh oecumenical council at Nice restores Image worship.
789	Willehad dies.
790	Libri Carolini.
794	Council at Frankfort-on-the-Maine against Adoptianism.
795—816	Leo III. pope.
796	Alcuin's school at Tours.
799	Paul Warnefried dies.
800	Coronation of Charlemagne at Rome.
801	Sergius the Paulician.
804	Alcuin dies.
814	Charlemagne dies.

Year.	
814—1073	FOURTH PERIOD.
814	Lewis the Pious, emperor.
814	Claudius of Turin.
817—824	Paschalis I. pope.
820—829	Michael II. Greek emperor.
824—827	Eugenius II. pope.
825	Synod of Paris respecting Image-worship.
828	Theodore Studita dies. Harold king of Denmark baptised. Anschar in Denmark.
827—844	Gregory IV. pope.
829	Anschar in Sweden.
829—842	Theophilus Greek emperor.
830	Greek imperial edict against Image worship. First appearance of the Pseudo-Isodorean Decretals.
831	Anschar archbishop of Hamburg. Paschasius Radbert De corpore et sanguine Domini.
835	The Paulician Sergius dies.
840	Claudius of Turin dies.
842	Synod of Constantinople declares for Image worship.
844—847	Sergius II. pope.
845	Hamburg destroyed by the Normans.
847—855	Leo IV. pope.
847	Rabanus Maurus archbishop of Mainz.
848	Synod of Mainz excommunicates Gottschalk.
850	Beginning of Saracen persecution in Spain.
852	Council of Cordova.
853	Second Synod of Chiersy against Gottschalk.
855	Council of Valence declares for Gottschalk. Pope Joanna.(?)
855—858	Benedict III. pope.
856	Rabanus Maurus dies.
858	Photius patriarch of Constantinople; beginning of the rupture between the Eastern and Western Churches.
858—867	Nicholas I. pope.
861	Methodius among the Bulgarians.
862	Iceland discovered.
863	Cyril and Methodius among the Moravians. Nicholas of Rome deposes Photius.
865	Anschar and Paschasius Radbert die.
867—886	Basil the Macedonian, Greek emperor.
867	Council of Constantinople: Photius deposes the pope.
867—872	Hadrian II. pope.
868	Ratramanus dies.
869	Council of Constantinople (eighth oecumenical for the Latin Church). Gottschalk dies in prison.
871—901	Alfred the Great.
872—882	John VIII. pope.
877	Scotus Erigena dies.
872—880	Council of Constantinople (eighth oecumenical for the Greek Church).
885—891	Stephen VI. pope.
891	Photius dies in exile.

Year.	
904—911	Sergius III. pope.
914—928	John X. pope.
927	Odo of Clugny.
931—973	John XI. pope.
934	Henry I. compels the Danes to receive Christianity.
936—973	Otto I. emperor.
955	Olga (Helena) baptized at Constantinople.
956—963	John XII. pope.
960	Hacon first Christian king of Norway.
963	John XII. deposed; Leo VIII. pope.
966	Meicislaw of Poland baptized.
982	Greenland discovered.
983—1002	Otto III. emperor.
985—996	John XV. pope.
993	First papal canonization (Ulrich of Augsburg).
996—999	Gregory V. pope.
999—1003	Pope Sylvester II.
1000	Iceland receives Christianity.
1002—1024	Henry II. emperor.
1008	Olaf of Sweden baptized.
1012—1024	Benedict VIII. pope.
1014—1035	Canute the Great.
1024—1039	Conrad II. emperor.
1024—1033	John XIX. pope.
1031	First interdict.
1032	First "Truce of God."
1033	Anselm born.
1033—1046	Benedict IX. pope.
1039—1056	Henry III. emperor.
1044	Sylvester III. (second pope).
1046	Synod of Sutri under Henry III. deposes three popes, and elects Clement II.
1046—1047	Clement II. pope.
1047	Henry III. dies.
1048	Damasus II. pope.
1049—1054	Leo IX. pope.
1050	Berengarius condemned at the Synod of Rome.
1054	Complete separation between the Eastern and Western churches.
1055	Albert bishop of Greenland.
1055—1057	Victor II. pope.
1056—1106	Henry IV. emperor.
1057—1058	Stephen IX. pope.
1058	Benedict X. pope.
1059	College of Cardinals. Papal prohibition of priestly functions to married clergy.
1061—1073	Alexander II. pope.
1066	Gottschalk murdered.
1070	Lanfranc archbishop of Canterbury.
1072	Peter Damiani dies.
1073—1085	Gregory VII. (Hildebrand) pope.

QUESTIONS.

SPREAD AND LIMITATION OF CHRISTIANITY.

§§ 95 — 98 ; 112, 113.

(§ 95.) Christian persecution in Persia ? Condition of the Eastern Church at the time of Mohammed's appearance ? Sketch of Mohammed and his doctrine. Account of his conquests and those of his successors. (§ 96.) State of Christianity in the British Churches ? Describe the conversion of the Saxons. Subsequent relations of the Saxon to the Old British Churches ? (§ 97.) Source of missions for France ? Describe the labors of Columban. . Source of missions for Germany ? Missionary labor of Willibrord ? Of Boniface ? Efforts of Charlemagne and Alcuin to organize German Christianity ? (§ 98.) Sketch Christian missions in Asia during the third period. (§ 112.) Sketch of Anschar. Nations to whom he carried the gospel ? Result of his labors. Comparison of his work with that of Boniface ? Subsequent history of Christianity among the Scandinavian races ? (§ 113.) First introduction of Christianity amongst the Slaves ? Subsequent progress during the fourth period. Resumé of Christian missions among the Gothic and Scandinavian races ?

CHURCH POLITY.

§§ 99 — 101 ; 114 — 117.

(§ 99.) Relation of church to state in the third period ? Nations in which state influence was strongest ? In which, weakest ? Four particulars in respect to which state influence was exerted ? Attitude of the church towards slavery ? (§ 100.) Monachism in this period ? Relation of monks to clergy ? Power of the bishop ? Of the Roman bishop ? Who contributed most to its increase ? Relations of the Roman bishop to the Greek, Lombard, Spanish, English, and Frankish churches ? (§ 114.) Condition of the papacy in the fourth period ? Sketch of the Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals. Object of the collection ? Opinions respecting their genuineness ? (§ 115.) Sketch of the popes of this period. The leading one ? (§ 116.) Relation of church to state in the fourth period ? Modes in which the church influenced the state ? (§ 117.) Morals of the clergy in this period ? Attempts at reform ?

LIFE AND WORSHIP.

§§ 102, 103; 118—120.

(§ 102.) Ecclesiastical discipline in the third period? State of education among the people? Among the clergy? (§ 103.) Change in respect to Sacred Music? The Gregorian chant? Use of the organ? Use of the Latin language in public worship? Change in the theory of the Lord's Supper? Saint worship, and Mariolatry, in this period? (§ 118.) State of education in the fourth period? Of church discipline? (§ 119.) Worship of saints, relics, and images? Development of sacred music? (§ 120.) Attempts at reformation in the fourth period.

HISTORY OF DOCTRINE.

§§ 104—110; 121—126.

(§ 104.) Sketch of the leader of Western theology in the third period. Biblical study in Ireland, England, and Spain? Influence of Charlemagne and Alcuin upon theological learning? (§ 105.) State of exegesis and dogmatic theology in the Eastern churches? Principal theologians? (§ 106.) Account of the Monothelite controversy. Decision of the First and Second Trullan councils? Monothelite sects? (§ 107.) Account of the Adoptian controversy. Principal defender and opposer? (§ 108.) Three theories respecting images? Which prevailed in the Greek churches. (§ 109.) Account of the Image controversy in the Greek churches. Decision of the seventh oecumenical council? Accounts of the Image controversy in the Roman churches? In the French and German churches? (§ 110.) Difference between the Western and Eastern churches respecting the Procession of the Spirit? Difference between the Image Worshipers and Iconoclasts respecting the Supper? (§ 121.) Dogmatic grounds of separation between the Eastern and Western churches? State of theology in the Greek church in the fourth period? Chief theologians? (§ 122.) Various theological tendencies in this period? Representatives of each? Characteristics of Scotus Erigena? Influence of Alfred the Great? (§ 123.) Relation of the Predestinarian controversy to a preceding one? Gottschalk's positions? Decision of the council of Chiersy? Of the synod of Valence? (§ 124.) Three views, in the first six centuries, of the Lord's Supper? Advocates of each? First definite enunciation of the dogma of Transubstantiation? Principal opponent and advocate? Result of the controversy? (§ 125.) General survey of the doctrines of Inspiration, Procession, Predestination, and the Supper, during the fourth period? (§ 126.) Sects of the fourth period?

ANDOVER PUBLICATIONS.

W. F. DRAPER, PUBLISHER,

ANDOVER, MASS.

Among the Andover Publications will be found choice and valuable books for intelligent readers; also works for the special use of Theological Students and Clergymen. The Catalogue embraces works on the Evidences and Defences of Christianity, Devotional books, Essays in Philosophy and Theology, Church History, Discrepancies of the Bible, Hermeneutics, Commentaries on various books of the Old and New Testaments, Harmonies of the New Testament in Greek and in English, Grammars of the New Testament in Greek, Hebrew Lexicon and Grammars, etc.

Descriptive Catalogues sent free on application. All books sent by mail postpaid, at the prices annexed, with special discounts to clergymen and theological students.

Address

W. F. DRAPER, PUBLISHER,

A-1

ANDOVER, MASS.

ANDOVER PUBLICATIONS,

EMBRACING

VALUABLE COMMENTARIES AND BIBLICAL WORKS.

W. F. DRAPER, PUBLISHER,

ANDOVER, MASS.

• Full descriptive Catalogues free on application.

ELLICOTT.

Critical and Grammatical Commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles. With Revised Translations. By Rt. Rev. Charles J. Ellicott, Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. 8vo.

Galatians. With an Introductory Notice by Prof. C. E. Stowe, \$1.25.

Ephesians, \$1.25. Thessalonians, \$1.25.

Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, \$1.75. Pastoral Epistles, \$1.75.

The whole Set in Two Volumes, bevelled edges, \$6.75.

"It is the crowning excellence of these Commentaries that they are exactly what they profess to be—*critical* and *grammatical*, and therefore in the best sense of the term, *exegetical*. . . . His results are worthy of all confidence. He is more careful than Tischendorf, slower and more steadily deliberate than Alford, and more patiently laborious than any other living New Testament critic, with the exception, perhaps, of Tregelles."

"To Bishop Ellicott must be assigned the first rank, if not the first place in the first rank, of English biblical scholarship. The series of Commentaries on the Pauline Epistle are in the highest style of critical exegesis."—*Methodist Quarterly*.

Also by the same Author.

Historical Lectures on the Life of our Lord Jesus Christ. Being the Hulsean Lectures for the year 1859. With Notes, Critical, Historical, and Explanatory. Crown 8vo. \$1.50

"An able book by an able man. It deals with the facts rather than with doctrines or truths of gospel history. It designs to harmonize, synchronize, and illustrate those facts. It is also apologetic in its character, being designed to vindicate the historical unity of the Evangelists. It is, therefore, a very seasonable and valuable book."—*Princeton Review*.

*HACKETT.

A Commentary on the Original Text of the Acts of the Apostles. By Horatio B. Hackett, D.D., Professor of Biblical Literature in Newton Theological Institution. 8vo. \$3.50

A re-issue of the last edition revised by Professor Hackett. . . . "We regard it as the best Commentary on the Acts which can be found in the English or any other language."—*Bibliotheca Sacra*.

Books Published by W. F. Draper.

HENDERSON.

Commentaries, Critical, Philological, and Exegetical. Translated from the Original Hebrew. By E. Henderson, D.D. 8vo.

The Book of the Twelve Minor Prophets. With a Biographical Sketch of the Author by Professor E. P. Barrows. \$3.00.
Jeremiah and Lamentations, \$2.25. Ezekiel, \$1.75.

"His Commentaries on the Minor Prophets and on Isaiah, are probably the best specimens of exegetical talent and learning which have ever appeared in England. . . . The same diligence, learning, sobriety, and judiciousness appear in Ezekiel as characterize the learned author's commentaries on Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the Minor Prophets."—*Bibliotheca Sacra*.

"The learning, the sound judgment, and the earnest religious spirit of the author stamp a standard value on his commentaries."—*Baptist Quarterly*.

"The work is invaluable for its philological research and critical acumen. . . . The notes are learned, reliable, and practical."—*American Presbyterian*.

LIGHTFOOT.

St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. A Revised Text, with Introduction, Notes, and Dissertations. By J. B. Lightfoot, D.D., Hulsean Professor of Divinity, and Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 8vo. \$3.00

"For a scholar's use Dr. Lightfoot's Commentary is invaluable. He and Bishop Ellicott worthily supplement each other. The revised text is one of the best recent contributions to a complete text of the Greek New Testament, and the criticisms on the text are concise and to the point."—*American Presbyterian Review*.

"Among the modern English commentaries on the New Testament Scriptures this appears to us to be the best. The critical dissertations, which form a leading feature of it, are in the highest degree valuable."—*New Englander*.

"This is a most valuable Commentary. The revised text is up to the very latest and best critical scholarship. . . . It is especially full and satisfactory on most of the leading topics connected with the Epistle."—*Lutheran Quarterly Review*.

MURPHY.

Critical and Exegetical Commentaries, with New Translations. By James G. Murphy, LL.D., T. C. D., Professor of Hebrew, Belfast. 8vo.

Genesis. With a Preface by J. P. Thompson, D.D., New York. \$3.00.
Exodus, \$2.50. Exodus, crown 8vo., \$1.25.
Leviticus, \$2.25. Psalms, \$3.50.

"The Commentaries of Murphy have many excellences. They are clear, discriminating, and comprehensive."—*Baptist Quarterly*.

"Like the other Commentaries of Dr. Murphy, his Commentary on the Psalms is distinguished by the ease and perspicuity of its style, its freedom from pedantry, and the excellent religious spirit pervading it. The Introduction, occupying the first fifty pages, is lucid and interesting."—*Bibliotheca Sacra*.

"Thus far nothing has appeared in this country for half a century on the first two books of the Pentateuch so valuable as the present two volumes [on Genesis and Exodus]. His style is lucid, animated, and often eloquent. His pages afford golden suggestions and key-thoughts. . . . Some of the laws of interpretation are stated with so fresh and natural clearness and force that they will permanently stand."—*Methodist Quarterly*.

"The most valuable contribution that has for a long time been made to the many aids for the critical study of the Old Testament is Mr. Draper's republication of Dr. Murphy on Genesis. Dr. Murphy adds to a thorough knowledge of the Hebrew, and of the science of interpretation, great common sense, genuine wit, and admirable power of expression."—*Congregationalist*.

"It is on the whole one of the best expositions of the Psalms accessible for popular instruction, and a valuable auxiliary to the work of preachers and teachers."—*Examiner and Chronicle*.

PEROWNE.

The Book of Psalms. A New Translation. With Introductions and Notes Explanatory and Critical. By J. J. Stewart Perowne, D.D., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Canon of Llandaff. Reprinted from the Third English Edition. Two Volumes. 8vo. \$6.75

"The elaborate work by Canon Perowne has some specially attractive features, not only in the notes upon the text, but in the preliminary Essays on Hebrew Poetry; the Origin and Formation of the Psalter; its Use in the Church; its Theology; the Inscriptions of the Psalms, etc. Special attention is given to the occasions and circumstances in which the Psalms were written, as having an important bearing upon their prophetic character, as well as aiding in their elucidation." — *The New York Observer*.

"It comprises in itself more excellences than any other commentary on the Psalms in our language, and we know of no single commentary in the German language which, all things considered, is preferable to it." — *Baptist Quarterly*.

STUART.

Critical and Exegetical Commentaries, with translations of the Text, by Moses Stuart, late Professor of Sacred Literature in Andover Theological Seminary. 12mo.

Romans, \$1.75.

Hebrews, \$1.75.

Proverbs, \$1.50.

Ecclesiastes, \$1.25.

The Commentaries on the Romans, Hebrews, and Ecclesiastes are edited and revised by Prof. R. D. C. Robbins.

"The Commentaries of Professor Stuart abide the test of time. Though somewhat diffusive in style, they contain so much thorough discussion of doctrinal points, so much valuable criticism on pregnant words, and such an earnest religious spirit, that they must live for generations as a part of the apparatus for the biblical student." — *The Independent*.

"His Commentary on the Romans is the most elaborate of all his works. It has elicited more discussion than any of his other exegetical volumes. It is the result of long-continued, patient thought. It expresses in clear style his maturest conclusions. Regarding it in all its relations, its antecedents and consequents, we pronounce it the most important Commentary which has appeared in this country on this Epistle. . . . The Commentary on Proverbs is the last work from the pen of Prof. Stuart. Both this Commentary and the one preceding it, on Ecclesiastes, exhibit a mellowness of spirit which savors of the good man ripening for heaven. . . . In learning and critical acumen they are equal to his former works." — *Bibliotheca Sacra*.

Miscellaneous Works of Professor Moses Stuart.

Critical History and Defence of the Old Testament Canon. 12mo. Revised Edition. \$1.50

"The work covers ground unoccupied, in the same form and extent, by any other English or American work. And yet it is ground with which every biblical scholar, but every well-trained minister, ought to be familiar." — *Methodist Quarterly*.

Miscellanies. Consisting of, 1. Letters to Dr. Channing on the Trinity; 2. Two Sermons on the Atonement; 3. Sacramental Sermon on the Lamb of God; 4. Dedication Sermon — Christianity a distinct Religion; 5. Letter to Dr. Channing on Religious Liberty; 6. Supplemental Notes and Postscripts of additional matter. 12mo. pp. xii and 764. \$1.25

A Grammar [Greek] of the New Testament Dialect. Second Edition, corrected, and mostly written anew. 8vo. Half cloth. \$1.25

Cary. *An Introduction to the Greek of the New Testament.*

By George L. Cary, of the Meadville Theological Seminary. 12mo.
pp. 72. 75 cents

"This small volume has been prepared for persons, either students of theology, or others who have not had the advantage of a knowledge of the Greek, and who nevertheless would be glad to read the New Testament in its original tongue. It gives the rudiments of the language so far as absolutely necessary for the understanding of New Testament Greek. It is well adapted to its purpose, and will prove of great service to such as have not had the advantage of a classical education."—*Lutheran Quarterly*.

"The simplicity of its method, its conciseness and perspicuity admirably adapt it to the use of such persons. With a moderate degree of application, any one with an ordinary capacity for acquiring language may in a short time master these elementary lessons, and having done so will be able to 'proceed at once to the reading of the easier portions of the New Testament.'"—*Theological and Homiletic Monthly*.

"This is substantially a primary Greek Grammar of the New Testament, intended for those who have had no previous knowledge of the language."—*The Central Baptist*.

"A handy little manual for those who wish to become familiar enough with Greek to read the New Testament."—*Zion's Herald*.

Mitchell. *The Critical Hand-book.* A Guide to the Authenticity, Canon, and Text of the New Testament. By Edward C. Mitchell, D.D. Illustrated by a Map, Diagrams, and Tables. 12mo. \$1.75

The plan of the book embraces, in the first place, a view of the present field of controversy on the subject of the Authenticity of the New Testament Scriptures as viewed from a historical and geographical stand-point. This is followed by a brief discussion of the leading points in the History of the Canon, and then by a *résumé* of the subject of Textual Criticism—History of the Text. In this part of the work, and the fourteen Tables which accompany it, care has been taken to combine brevity with the greatest possible accuracy of statement. The best recent authorities have been consulted, and the author has received valuable aid from eminent scholars in England and America, especially from Dr Ezra Abbot, of Cambridge, who has bestowed upon the whole of Part III. and the accompanying Tables much patient thought, suggesting many new points of interest and value. One of these tables, for instance, shows at a glance what was the state of civilization at a given period; what writers flourished, whether poets or philosophers or physicists or historians. A second table shows what Christian Fathers were contemporaneous. Another table gives a list of witnesses and actors in the scenes of Christian history and the places in which they acted. Others give catalogues of disputed books, the uncial Mss. the cursive Mss. ancient versions, etc. There are furnished also several facsimiles of different codices of the New Testament.

"It is certainly 'A Guide' which must prove exceedingly convenient and valuable to scholars. I have read and re-read it with the exception of some of the Tables, and have found it accurate and to the point, giving the essential facts clearly, and in a suitable form for reference. As a 'Handbook' for frequent use I know of nothing equal to it."—*Alvah Hovey, D.D., Pres. Newton Theological Institution*.

"It is brief, clear, and, so far as we can see quite accurate, and a thoroughly serviceable and important book."—*Congregationalist*.

"This volume gathers up and presents in a comparatively brief compass a great deal that is worth knowing in regard to several branches of biblical criticism. It contains what every thorough student of the Holy Scriptures needs to understand."—*The Churchman*.

"The tables at the end are a feature of the book of peculiar advantage. It is to be recommended to all students of the New Testament."—*C. W. Hodge in Presbyterian Review*.

"Of this book it may be most truly said '*multum in parvo*.' It well answers the purpose for which it was designed. It furnishes the material necessary to a refutation of the charge so frequently made that the New Testament is largely mythical. It is a strong defence of Christianity."—*Baptist Quarterly*. F-13

Davies. *A Compendious and Complete Hebrew and Chaldeæ Lexicon of the Old Testament*; with an English-Hebrew Index. By Benjamin Davies, Ph.D., LL.D. Carefully Revised, with a concise Statement of the Principles of Hebrew Grammar, by Edward C. Mitchell, D.D. 8vo. Cloth, \$4.00; Morocco backs, \$4.75

"It is in many respects an improvement upon either of the Lexicons now in use. Dr. Davies modestly calls himself the editor of the work, but it is anything but a mere revision or compilation. Nearly every page bears evidence of original thought and independent investigation, and many improvements have been made upon the work of previous lexicographers in the handling of roots and derivatives.

"While the Lexicons of Gesenius and Fürst have been made the chief basis, — as they must be for any genuine advance in this direction, — the definitions have all been re-written and condensed without being abridged, so as to make them more convenient for reference, and the work less bulky and expensive."

So far from being an abridgment, *the present edition will be found to contain over a thousand more Hebrew words or forms than appear in Tregelles's or Robinson's Gesenius*, besides incorporating into the body of the work all the grammatical forms contained in Robinson's Analytical Appendix.

"I regard it as a very valuable addition to our Hebrew text-books. It is concise, accurate, sufficiently full in definitions, and admirably adapted for the use of students. Prof. Mitchell's admirable compend of the Principles of Hebrew Grammar at the beginning of the book, and the English-Hebrew Index at the end, are valuable helps not found in the ordinary Lexicons of Hebrew." — *Prof. Henry A. Buttz, in Drew Theological Seminary.*

Mitchell. *A Concise Statement of the Principles of Hebrew Grammar.* For the Use of Teachers. By Edward C. Mitchell, D.D. 8vo. Paper, 15 cents

Gesenius. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar.* Translated by Benjamin Davies, LL.D., from Rödiger's Edition. Thoroughly Revised and Enlarged, on the Basis of the Latest Edition of Prof. E. Kautzsch, D.D., and from other recent Authorities, by Edward C. Mitchell, D.D. With full Subject, Scripture, and Hebrew Indexes. 8vo. Cloth, \$3.00

In preparing an edition of Davies' Gesenius' Grammar which should be suited to the wants of American teachers and students, the Editor set before himself the aim of combining the acknowledged excellences of Gesenius with a more lucid and practical arrangement.

Availing himself of the essential improvements of Kautzsch (indeed nearly every page and paragraph has felt the influence of his scientific discernment in the suggestion of improved forms of statement) the Editor has also derived some hints from the Grammars of Ewald, Stade, Delitzsch, and others. No change has been made in the numbering of sections, and the notes of Dr. Davies have been preserved, so far as they are not superseded by the text as reconstructed.

A new and important feature of this edition consists in the very full *Indexes of Subjects*, of Scripture, and of Hebrew words. The Hebrew index will be found especially valuable for the explanation of difficult forms.

"This Grammar certainly deserves a high rank among those available for the use of English-speaking scholars. It is of convenient size. It is clearly printed. It has the virtue, so rare in works translated from the German, of being in good and intelligible English. It is much more full in the number of topics it treats than most Hebrew Grammars. Its views of the phenomena and the history of the language includes the latest discoveries. In its presentation of Hebrew syntax this edition has greatly improved upon the older editions of Gesenius." — *The Presbyterian Review.*

"A feature which will be found to add much to the convenience of the student, is the placing of tables of the verbs, nouns, numerals, and prefix prepositions with suffixes together, at the beginning of the book." — *The Watchman.*

Wright. *The Logic of Christian Evidences.* By G. Frederick Wright. 16mo. pp. 328. Cloth, \$1.50.

From Professor Zöckler. — Prof. Otto Zöckler one of the most eminent German writers upon apologetics has a somewhat extended notice of this book in the *Beweis des Glaubens*, for Sept. 1880, in which, after speaking of the extensive influence of "Paley's Evidences," he uses the following language which we translate. "The constant appearance of new forms of sceptical and hypercritical opposition to revealed truth makes it necessary also for the Evidences that there should be a continual reshaping and improvement of them by their scientific guardians and representatives. Among the more important attempts in this direction in recent times the present small but comprehensive book of an acting Congregational pastor at Andover, Mass., deserves to be conspicuously mentioned" (p. 491).

"A remarkable and remarkably successful attempt to condense a library into a small volume. . . . Mr. Wright appears to lay no claim to originality; he quotes freely from a great multitude of authors; and his reading appears to have embraced all the best authors against as well as for the Christian faith; but his quotations are so exactly apposite that they never mar the unity of the composition. Some of the most striking points are new, either original with Mr. Wright, or having never before been introduced into works on the evidences. . . . Fair-minded men, weighing Mr. Wright's book judicially, will admit that the evidence here given would, on any other subject than one involving such momentous results, create a practical certainty. The book would form an admirable text-book for Bible-classes or college classes, and will give solid comfort and strength to all readers who have any desire to be able to give a reason for believing." — *Rev. Dr. Thomas Hill in the Bibliotheca Sacra*, April 1880.

"The presentation of the argument is forcible and convincing, and the book is instructive and suggestive. The author expresses the hope "that none of it is beyond the reach of plain men and women of thoughtful turn who make up their lack of school-privileges by increased assiduity in their private reading and study." We think it well adapted to this class; and to meet the coarse assaults on Christianity through the press, which are industriously circulated more widely than ministers and Christian people are generally aware. It will be valuable to ministers as giving in compact form the result of much reading and thought by a vigorous mind on the recent aspects of scepticism." — *New Englander*, May 1880.

"Our author does his work admirably, and his book is a valuable contribution to the science of apologetics. We have no hesitation in recommending the book to all theological students, and also to others who desire to have any troublesome doubts concerning the truth of Christianity resolved in a logical and satisfactory manner. We have shown our estimate of the work by adopting it as a text-book in our department in the Theological School." — *Cumberland Presb. Quarterly*.

"This is an excellent and timely work. Too many books on the 'Evidences,' of the merits and force of this, we cannot have. Such works as this are sorely needed for use among the assailants as well as the inquiring." — *Baptist Review*, July 1880.

"It is a very compact volume, and we should think that even a Thomas Paine would rise from its perusal with the consciousness that it furnishes a hard nut for the sceptical hammer to crack." — *Methodist Quarterly*, April, 1880.

"The plan of the book is well conceived and well executed. The author has manifestly been a diligent and intelligent student of science, and is familiar with the principles and methods of modern doubt." — *Presbyterian Review*, Oct. 1880.

"A most valuable contribution to the religious and theological literature of the age." — *Oberlin Review*, April 8th.

"The author uses the analogical reasoning with great force and effectiveness against the new phases of sceptical difficulty." — *Lutheran Quarterly*, April 1880.

"As a text-book of evidences suited to the times, it seems to us that Mr. Wright's book is far better adapted than either Butler or Paley, which have been in use so long." — *The Press, Philadelphia*, April 7th.

"A timely and able book, so brief, practical, and compact as to be of popular service. . . . A careful table of contents and a good index enhance the value of this excellent hand-book." — *Springfield Republican*, May 3d.

Shedd. *Translations by Wm. G. T. Shedd, formerly Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Andover Theological Seminary.*

Eloquence a Virtue; or, Outlines of a Systematic Rhetoric
Translated from the German of Dr. Francis Theremin. With an Introductory Essay [by Prof. Shedd]. Revised Edition. 12mo. pp. 216. \$1.00

From the Princeton Review.

"The doctrine of the treatise is, that eloquence is distinguished from philosophy, poetry, and all other forms of expressed thought in having for its object to move men to action, and that this is accomplished by exciting their active, i.e. their moral faculties, etc. . . . The subject is ably unfolded in this compact yet thorough treatise. What, however, is exhibited by Theremin in a dry light, in the form of naked philosophic statement, is displayed by Professor Shedd in his Introductory Essay, with that glow of life, beauty, and force which distinguishes his writings."

From the Bibliotheca Sacra.

"The Introductory Essay which Professor Shedd has prefixed to this valuable Treatise, is elaborate, vigorous, impressive. It excites the mind not only to thought, but also to the expression of thought—to inward and outward activity. The whole volume is characterized by freshness and originality of remark, a purity and earnestness of moral feeling."

From the Congregational Quarterly.

"It is not a work of surface suggestion, but of thorough and philosophic analysis, and, as such, is of great value to the student, and especially to him who habitually addresses men on the most important themes."

"This is a work of much solid value. It is adapted to advanced students, and can be read and re-read with advantage by professed public speakers, however accomplished they may be in the important art of persuasion. This edition is an improvement upon the other, containing a new Introductory Essay illustrating the leading position of the work, and a series of questions adapting it to the use of the student."
— *Boston Recorder*.

A Manual of Church History. By Henry E. F. Guericke, Doctor and Professor of Theology in Halle.

Ancient Church. Comprising the First Six Centuries. [With a Preface by the Translator, a Chronological Table, an Index and a Series of Questions.]
8vo. pp. xvi and 433. Reduced to \$2.75

From the Evangelical Review.

"Perhaps it would be difficult in the same space to find so much matter, or so complete a history during the period of which it treats, as is given in this Manual. The volume is one of the most valuable of its kind in the department of Ecclesiastical History."

From the Bibliotheca Sacra.

"We regard Professor Shedd's version as a happy specimen of the *transfusion*, rather than a *translation*, which many of the German treatises should receive. The style of his version is far superior to that of the original."

From the North British Review.

"Characterized by research, devoutness, firm grasp of evangelical truth, and careful exhibition of the practical as well as the intellectual aspects of Christianity."

"Guericke's Manual is complete in the particular lines of history he has chosen, and is a most useful and reliable book for the theological class-room. Prof. Shedd has wisely translated with freedom, and has improved the structure of the work."
— *Nonconformist*.

Mediæval Church. (From A.D. 590 to 1073). pp. viii and 160. \$1.25

"This portion of Guericke's Church History continues the account down to A.D. 1073, when Hildebrand ascended the Papal chair as Gregory VII. It includes, among other topics, the spread of Christianity among the Gothic, Scandinavian, and Sclavic races; the distracting controversies respecting the two Wills in Christ, Image Worship, and the Sacrament of the Supper; and the great schism between the East and West."



338865

BR

145

G93

V. 2
Lib.

has

v. 2

Guericke, Heinrich Ernst Ferdinand, 1803-1878.

A manual of church history, by Henry E. F. Guericke ...
Translated from the German by William G. T. Shedd ...
Andover, W. F. Draper; New York, Wiley and Halsted

18. -82cc -703

2 v. 24^{cm}.

Imprint varies: v. (2) Andover, W. F. Draper.

Projected translation of third volume not published? *of. note, v. 1, p. viii.*

"Critical survey of the literature in church history": v. 1, p. 10-18.

Contents.—(I) Ancient church history, comprising the first six centuries.—(II) Mediaeval church history, A. D. 590-A. D. 1073.

1. Church history—Primitive and early church. 2. Church history—Middle ages. I. Shedd, William Greenough Thayer, 1820-1894, +c.

Library of Congress

BR145.G93

32-32103

CCSC/mm

